

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:  
H. R. 3047. A bill for the relief of Elmer E. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
By Mr. TEAGUE:  
H. R. 3048. A bill for the relief of Tatyana Karapanca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARBURTON:  
H. R. 3049. A bill for the relief of Roman J. Halla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
By Mr. WATTS:  
H. R. 3050. A bill for the relief of Kenichi Kaneko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
By Mr. WILSON of California:  
H. R. 3051. A bill for the relief of Eugene Hoch, and her child, Yolanda Hoch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

51. By Mr. BETTS: Petition of S. S. Weaver, requesting consideration of certain alleged copyrights set forth therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

52. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions of the executive board and general executive council of the New Jersey State Federation of Labor, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, favoring restored residential mail delivery service at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

53. By Mr. JENSEN: Petition of Ellen Mayo, recording secretary, and 136 other members of the Departmental Club, Corning, Iowa, urging amendment of the election laws which pertain to the United States Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

54. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Bernardino Malong, Laois, Labrader, Pangasinan Philippines, relative to stating a grievance regarding his claim filed with the War Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

55. Also, petition of Nunilo D. Marapao, Province of Bohol, Municipality of Ubay, Philippines, relative to stating the grievances of a number of Filipinos regarding the loss of certain foodstuffs and money due to mistreatment by the Japanese in 1942; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, in this pavilion of prayer, help us to fling open the shuttered windows of our darkened lives to the effulgent light of Thy presence, so that in our daily work we may reflect some broken beams of Thy glory. Teach us by the adventure of faith how to be victors over life, not victims of it, and that to live worthily we must have a faith fit to live by, a self fit to live with, and a cause fit to live for.

Enlarge the sensitive area of our sympathy, we pray. Write deep upon our hearts the suffering and pain of the shepherdless multitudes so broken by the burdens and stress of these cruel years. Grant us such a vision of our world and its appalling need as to make us sharers with Thee in saving it from the worst that is in man, to the best that is in Thy will and plan when Thy king-

dom comes. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 10, 1953, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed, without amendment, to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) expressing sympathy for the peoples of the Netherlands, Great Britain, and Belgium in the disaster suffered by them.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 568) to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper, and it was signed by the Vice President.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

##### REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF CLINTON J. RILEY, JR., BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Treasury Department had settled the claim of Clinton J. Riley, Jr., in the amount of \$3,710; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3841 OF REVISED STATUTES RELATING TO ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF MAIL

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

##### LAW ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a law enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., entitled "Authorizing the sale to the Virgin Islands Corporation, a Federal instrumentality, of the electric light and power facilities and related assets of the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John" (with an accompany-

ing paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

##### PUBLICATION ENTITLED "FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION REPORTS, VOLUME 9"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the Commission's newly issued publication entitled "Federal Power Commission Reports, Volume 9" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

##### REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

##### USE OF CERTAIN CERTIFICATES BY OFFICERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Armed Forces of the United States, in connection with certain pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

##### REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, that no contracts were negotiated by that committee for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

##### STATISTICAL TABLES REFLECTING BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS BY BANKRUPTCY COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts and other pertinent data (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF UNITED STATES COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

##### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to extend the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to Federal old-age and survivors' insurance benefits to additional and certain other classes of employment and workers

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to extend the provisions of the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance benefits sections of the Social Security Act to include additional and certain other classes of employment and workers; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States to the presiding officer of each

branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In senate, adopted, January 26, 1953.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,

"Clerk.

"In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, February 2, 1953.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,

"Clerk."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to a higher minimum-wage law

"Whereas after considerable study by the New England Governors' Textile Committee, confirming the fact that wage differences between the North and the South are one of the basic reasons for New England textile industry's plight; and

"Whereas an urgent need exists for action to eliminate such wage differentials: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States in favor of a new higher minimum-wage law with effective administration; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of state to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In senate, adopted, January 26, 1953.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,

"Clerk.

"In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, February 2, 1953.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,

"Clerk."

A resolution adopted by the Florida State Townsend Auxiliary, Unit 75, Miami, Fla., favoring the substitution of the so-called Townsend old-age pension plan for the present social-security program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Three concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Utah; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 30th Legislature of the State of Utah, congratulating President Dwight D. Eisenhower upon his election to the Presidency of the United States of America

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas the people of the United States, by their vote in the recent election have chosen Dwight D. Eisenhower, as the President of the United States; and

"Whereas grave and important questions face our beloved country and its people; and

"Whereas, by character, training, and experience, Dwight D. Eisenhower is preeminently qualified for this highest office within the gift of the people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring herein, do hereby send to our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, our sincere congratulations and best wishes for a successful administration as President of the United States of America, and extend to him our assurance of utmost loyalty and support in meeting and solving the momentous tasks that lie ahead. We invoke the rich blessings of a kind providence to preserve him in life and health, in order that he might ably and efficiently discharge the duties of his high office; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to President Dwight D. Eisen-

hower, each Member of the congressional delegation from Utah and the Governor of the State of Utah."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

"Concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 30th Legislature of the State of Utah, congratulating Ivy Baker Priest upon her appointment as Treasurer of the United States of America

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas the President of the United States has imposed special confidence and trust in the ability and loyalty of Ivy Baker Priest; and

"Whereas she has been appointed to the high office of Treasurer of the United States; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Utah, her native State, take pride in her integrity and devotion to duty which fit her for this important office: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring herein, do hereby send to our esteemed citizen, Ivy Baker Priest, our sincere congratulations and best wishes in receiving this appointment. May she have a successful administration with much satisfaction in the discharge of her duties; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Ivy Baker Priest, Treasurer of the United States, each Member of the congressional delegation from Utah, and the Governor of the State of Utah."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 30th Legislature of the State of Utah, congratulating Hon. Ezra Taft Benson upon his appointment as Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas Ezra Taft Benson, a distinguished citizen of the State of Utah, who by his achievements in the field of agriculture and his faithful discharge of duty in church activity, civic responsibility, Farm Bureau work, and national recognition in the Boy Scout organization, has been chosen, appointed, and confirmed as Secretary of Agriculture in the Cabinet of President Dwight D. Eisenhower; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has imposed special confidence and trust in the ability, loyalty, and fidelity of Ezra Taft Benson; and

"Whereas by his sterling character, high intelligence, and humility he is preeminently qualified to faithfully discharge the duties of this high office; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Utah and his friends everywhere are justly proud of his appointment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Utah, the Governor concurring herein, do hereby send to our esteemed citizen, Ezra Taft Benson, our sincere congratulations and best wishes for a successful administration as Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America. May he find much joy and satisfaction in the discharge of the duties of his office and achieve outstanding success therein; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Ezra Taft Benson, each Member of the congressional delegation from Utah, and the Governor of the State of Utah."

## FLOOD CONTROL IN VERDIGRIS RIVER VALLEY—RESOLUTION OF VERDIGRIS RIVER FLOOD CONTROL ASSOCIATION, NEODESHA, KANS.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, the past 2 years, and particularly since the great flood of 1951, the people of Kansas have been keenly aware of the need for flood-control measures.

I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution submitted to me by the members of the Chamber of Commerce of Neodesha, Kans., requesting that sufficient appropriations be approved by the Congress to enable the construction of Toronto Dam on the Verdigris River.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Verdigris River Flood Control Association represents approximately 10,000 property owners with direct interest in flood control in the Verdigris River Valley; and

Whereas the Army engineers have repeatedly reported the proper approach to flood control for the Verdigris River is the Toronto Dam first; and

Whereas this matter has had favorable consideration in the past, but no appropriation having been made by Congress; and

Whereas the Verdigris River Flood Control Association deems it advisable to again present this matter for the attention of Government officials who are in position to recognize the necessity of flood control on the Verdigris River in order to prevent disastrous floods and also as a matter of water storage. A practical example is the Fall River Dam; and

Whereas it is considered by said association that United States Senators from Kansas, Andrew F. Schoeppe and Frank Carlson, and Representatives Errett P. Scrivner, Myron V. George, Edward H. Rees, Clifford R. Hope, and Wint Smith, and United States Senators from Oklahoma, Robert S. Kerr and Mike Monroney, and Representatives William G. Stigler, Carl Albert, Tom Steed, John Jarman, Toby Morris, Victor Wickersham, and Page Belcher, and the Subcommittee on Civil Functions and Appropriations, in formal manner have brought to their attention the need of this matter and the appropriation of funds for the immediate beginning: Now be it

Resolved, That the Verdigris River Flood Control Association urge the above-mentioned parties to use their influence to obtain appropriations sufficient to construct the dam; and be it further

Resolved, That the Neodesha Chamber of Commerce relying on the good will and standing of our Government representatives do hereby urge them to help make the proposed dam a reality.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, NEODESHA, KANS.,  
BOB BACON, President.  
J. M. STEFFEN, Secretary.

## EARLIER OPENING DATE OF HUNTING SEASON FOR MIGRATORY WATERFOWL — RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA STATE SENATE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Senate of the Legislature of North Dakota,



which I believe has a great deal of merit and widespread interest.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, under the rule, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### Senate Resolution 4

Resolution requesting the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to allow an earlier opening date of the hunting season for migratory waterfowl, and to provide compensation for damage to crops caused by migratory waterfowl

Whereas the farmers of the State of North Dakota have suffered substantial damage through the loss and destruction of grain by ducks while such grain is lying in a swath or shock; and

Whereas hunting season on ducks does not open until the month of October which prevents hunters and farmers from minimizing this annual damage through their hunting activities: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota*, That the United States Fish and Wildlife Service be requested to allow the opening of the hunting season for migratory waterfowl not later than September 15 of each year; and that the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service consider the feasibility of compensating farmers for crop damage directly attributable to migratory waterfowl; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and Members of Congress from the State of North Dakota.

C. P. DAHL,  
President of the Senate.  
EDWARD LENO,  
Secretary of the Senate.

#### ALLEVIATION OF FALLING PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS—RESOLU- TION OF STATE SENATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]; I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted on February 10, 1953, by the Senate of the Minnesota State Legislature. The resolution requests the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Minnesota Members of the Congress to reenact legislation to alleviate steadily falling prices of farm products.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution requesting the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and Minnesota Members of Congress, to reenact legislation to alleviate steadily falling prices of farm products

Whereas selling prices of farm products generally have fallen drastically during the past year; and

Whereas prices of farm machinery and supplies, as well as tax burdens are rapidly increasing; and

Whereas there is no indication of relief in a market controlled by many forces, both domestic and foreign, and over which the farmer has no control; and

Whereas it has been the policy of our Government to aid and assist farmers suffering

from sudden and drastic market changes: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota*, That this situation be called to the attention of the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and the Minnesota Members of Congress, with the request that steps be taken immediately to alleviate declining prices of farm products; be it further

*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and Minnesota Members of Congress.

Adopted by the senate, State of Minnesota, February 10, 1953.

P. G. TORREY,  
Secretary of the Senate.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. KNOWLAND (for Mr. THYE) also presented a resolution of the Senate of the State of Minnesota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 35. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time during which requests may be made for reimbursement for damages to public airports resulting from military operations; with amendments (Rept. No. 38).

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 876. A bill for the relief of Dr. Morad Malek-Aslani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 877. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 878. A bill for the relief of David Lee Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 879. A bill to amend section 12 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BUTLER of Maryland):

S. 880. A bill to amend the license law of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 881. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Janusz Plucinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 882. A bill for the relief of Song Yong Cho; and

S. 883. A bill for the relief of Tokuko Kobayashi and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 884. A bill for the relief of Arthur Sroka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 885. A bill to prohibit the acceptance of certain offices or employment by persons

who within 2 years have served as members of certain regulatory agencies of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 886. A bill for the relief of Aleen Archer Nield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 887. A bill to permit the exchange and amendment of farm units on Federal irrigation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT (for Mr. MUNDT):

S. 888. A bill to amend section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 889. A bill for the relief of Chester A. Fisher; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 890. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vitulli; and

S. 891 (by request). A bill for the relief of Albina Scias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ROBERTSON, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

S. 892. A bill to dissolve the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and transfer certain of its functions relating to national defense to other agencies of the Government, to amend section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BYRD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 893. A bill for the relief of David T. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 894. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain national forest land in Basalt, Colo.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 895. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to extend to certain members of the Armed Forces who were placed on the retired list in advanced rank the same credit for foreign service performed prior to 1913 which is accorded to other members not so advanced in rank on the retired list;

S. 896. A bill to provide for the promotion of certain retired officers of the Regular Navy recalled to active duty during World War II, and for other purposes; and

S. 897. A bill to extend the time for making application for terminal-leave pay under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 898. A bill to grant additional income tax exemptions and deductions to taxpayers who are permanently disabled, and to allow additional income tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting dependents who are permanently disabled;

S. 899. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, 74th Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, Philippine Islands, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unmarried widows, child, or children; and

S. 900. A bill for the relief of Walter John Gamel; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 901. A bill to grant former owners a preference with respect to the purchase of certain real property acquired under the reclamation laws and no longer needed for the purpose for which it was acquired; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 902. A bill to authorize the purchase of land and improvements in Gunnison County, Colo., to facilitate research into range improvement and rangeland management in the Rocky Mountain area, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 903. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when movement is arranged for, or on behalf of, the United States of America or an instrumentality thereof;

S. 904. A bill to standardize rates on household goods shipped by the United States Government for its employees;

S. 905. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke or amend, under certain conditions, water carrier certificates and permits;

S. 906. A bill to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act;

S. 907. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by requiring the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders;

S. 908. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; and

S. 909. A bill to authorize the training of an adequate backlog of airmen to meet the civil and military needs of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 910. A bill for the relief of Fausto Leonardo Marcal;

S. 911. A bill for the relief of Randi Lu Clark (Sugimoto, Sachiko);

S. 912. A bill for the relief of Bruno Ewald Paul and Margit Paul;

S. 913. A bill for the relief of Emma Pomeroy Von Lewinski;

S. 914. A bill for the relief of Mark Valner;

S. 915. A bill for the relief of Augusta Bley (also known as Augustina Bleys);

S. 916. A bill for the relief of Velko D. Kovacic;

S. 917. A bill for the relief of Stefan Burda, Anna Burda, and Nikolai Burda; and

S. 918. A bill for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 919. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to extend annuity benefits to employees at age 50 involuntarily separated from the service after having rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEHMAN (by request):

S. 920. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 921. A bill amending the definition of a dependent, for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 922. A bill to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, District of Columbia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 923. A bill to provide for perfecting the title of C. A. Lundy to certain lands in the State of California heretofore patented by the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 924. A bill for the relief of Sofia B. Panagouloupoulos Kanell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. 925. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to prohibit the Interstate Commerce Commission from regulating the duration of certain leases for the

use of equipment by motor carriers, and the amount of compensation to be paid for such use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the late Dr. Daniel David Palmer, of Iowa, the founder of chiropractic; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARRAN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

## CONTROL OF WATER RESOURCES AND IMPROVEMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, among the most pressing of the problems that face our people is that of controlling the water resources of our country.

In Texas, as in so many other States, water is all too frequently a feast or famine proposition. In times of flood, water falls upon our land by the ton, washing away precious topsoil and smashing property and equipment. In times of drought, we turn to our reservoirs only to find that they are too few and depleted too rapidly.

Both National and local governments have taken important steps to meet this problem in the past two decades. Huge works have been authorized and constructed. But there is an important gap in the programs thus far set under way.

At present, there is no authority for direct local-Federal cooperation on flood-prevention programs in small, upstream-watershed areas.

I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is designed to close that gap. It is similar to legislation sponsored in the House of Representatives by my good friend, the Honorable W. R. POAGE. It is the same bill which was approved by the House of Representatives during the last Congress.

The Senate was unable to consider the measure last year. But it is my earnest hope that we can get an early start in this Congress and bring it to the floor for action.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred three resolutions adopted by the soil conservation district supervisors at Mineral Wells, Tex., bearing upon this subject.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolutions will be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bill (S. 877) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and local agencies in the planning and carrying out of works of improvement for soil conservation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its

title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolutions presented by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas upstream floodwaters are continuing to cause sediment, crops and property damages, and the loss of lives; and

Whereas upstream floodwaters can best be controlled by slowing down water where it falls with land treatment and small detention structures; and

Whereas the upstream flood-control program now being conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture needs to be continued; and

Whereas the upstream flood-control program as conducted by the United States Department of Agriculture needs further expansion over more major watersheds; and

Whereas upstream flood-control measures increase the life expectancy of major reservoirs; and

Whereas there is certain legislation being proposed to the 83d Congress for the purpose of placing all upstream flood-control work under the Corps of Army Engineers, whose work is confined to large reservoirs and downstream reclamation; and

Whereas H. R. 559, 83d Congress, seeks continuance of upstream flood control by the United States Department of Agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we strongly urge favorable consideration and passage by the 83d Congress of H. R. 559, by the Honorable W. R. POAGE, of Texas; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the Committee on Public Works, to Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, of the Department of Agriculture, and to Members of Congress from the State of Texas.

We, the soil-conservation district supervisors of Texas, assembled in our 12th annual meeting at Mineral Wells, Tex., January 22 and 23, 1953, express our appreciation and commendation of the understanding of the problem of soil and water conservation expressed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in his speech delivered at Omaha, Neb., September 18, 1952. With the broad knowledge of the conservation problem displayed and with his expressed confidence in soil-conservation districts organized under State laws and governed by boards of local farmers and ranchers, we look forward to continuing and greater progress toward the solution of one of the greatest problems confronting the Nation and the world today—conservation of our soil and water.

President Eisenhower said:

"I'm a zealous believer in conservation, both as a national policy and as a personal creed. I have seen firsthand in many parts of the world what soil and fertility losses can do to civilizations. I have crossed great deserts that once were fertile granaries—now laid waste because man wasn't intelligent enough or didn't care enough to preserve his soil."

"To build a strong, secure United States, we must save our soil—and improve our soil. We aren't now doing the job fast enough or well enough. . . ."

"The Soil Conservation Service is a competent technical agency that makes its know-how available to farmers in locally organized farm-run soil-conservation districts. It comes into the districts to help farmers only at their invitation. . . ."

"I strongly favor farmer-managed soil-conservation districts, with the Soil Conservation Service and other public agencies giving such help as farmers request."

Whereas the State soil-conservation law of Texas was enacted by the 46th legislature in 1939 and since that time 166 soil-conservation districts have been organized,



embracing over 90 percent of the State's total area; and

Whereas during the life of Texas soil-conservation districts, conservation accomplishments have been greater than during all past time and benefits through increased production and increased income have been great even during recent years of severe drought; and

Whereas we look forward with confidence to increasing progress and benefit through the continuing democratic functioning of the soil-conservation districts assisted by the Soil Conservation Service and other agencies of Federal, State, and local governments: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we do hereby commend the President for the strong position that he has taken; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be supplied to our President, to Secretary of Agriculture Benson, Texas Congressmen and Senators, the Governor of the State of Texas, and the Republican National Committee.

Whereas a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives has reported on its study of national civil works; and

Whereas the report of the subcommittee recommends that legislation applying to surveys and investigations by the Department of Agriculture on watersheds be abolished and that the remainder of the flood-control program of the Department of Agriculture be made dependent upon and subject to the approval of the Corps of Army Engineers; and

Whereas it is the sense of the membership and officers of this organization that such action, if taken by the Congress, will deprive the farmers and ranchers of this State and this Nation of a program that already has proved itself greatly beneficial to agriculture and rewarding to farmers and ranchers to the extent of protecting agricultural land, increasing production and yielding greater net returns; and

Whereas 75 percent of the damages from floods occur on agricultural lands in creek watershed areas which get no protection from the big dams and main stream improvements; and

Whereas it is the belief of this organization that the action recommended by the subcommittee otherwise would accomplish no worth while purpose but on the other hand would nullify and destroy the preparatory work that has been performed on numerous watersheds of the Nation by the Department of Agriculture: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Association of Texas Soil Conservation District Supervisors, in annual meeting in Mineral Wells, Tex., January 22, 1953, declare to the Committee on Public Works its belief that the recommendations of the subcommittee would be contrary to the best interests of agriculture and the security of this Nation and that the Committee on Public Works be urged to discharge the subcommittee and table its report; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Association of Texas Soil Conservation District Supervisors, ask the Committee on Public Works give faithful consideration to the strengthening and acceleration of the flood-control program of the Department of Agriculture through such means as may be at its disposal; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the Committee on Public Works, to Secretary Ezra Taft Benson of the Department of Agriculture, and to Members of Congress from the State of Texas.

#### DISSOLUTION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr.

BRICKER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], my colleague the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to dissolve the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and transfer certain of its functions relating to national defense to other agencies of the Government, to amend section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 892) to dissolve the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and transfer certain of its functions relating to national defense to other agencies of the Government, to amend section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BYRD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement by Mr. BYRD is as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Senators BRICKER and ROBERTSON of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and Senators FERGUSON and WILLIAMS, have joined me as sponsors of a bill which I have introduced in the Senate today for the abolition of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Under the bill the Secretary of the Treasury would begin next January 1 liquidating the 21-year-old temporary depression agency which has outstanding loans totaling upward of \$700 million. The agency this year is costing more than \$14.5 million in administrative overhead, and it is employing more than 2,000 people—about half of them in Washington and the other half in 5 branches and 32 loan offices scattered throughout the country and in Puerto Rico and Alaska.

The bill would direct that the net proceeds from the liquidation shall be applied exclusively to reduction of the national debt.

The RFC was originally established in 1932, for limited duration, with \$500 million in capital supplied out of the United States Treasury. Under subsequent legislation its lending activities are now financed from \$100 million of capital stock, Treasury borrowing authority and \$250 million of retained earnings. Its lending authority extends until June 30, 1954, and it may have as much as \$993 million outstanding at any one time.

Except the effective date which is necessarily moved forward, the bill we are introducing today is identical with one for the same purpose I introduced in the last session of Congress and which narrowly failed of passage in the Senate last year after it had been demonstrated that the agency's services were subject to abuse when it had nothing to do.

The bill would abolish the Corporation and its lending authority. It would start and expedite liquidation of the old-line RFC programs by the Secretary of the Treasury, contemplating the use of Treasury Department facilities both in Washington and in the field. It would provide for uninterrupted continuity in the services now rendered by the RFC in connection with current defense and preparedness emergency financing. It would transfer to other agencies the management of rubber, tin, and fiber enterprises, etc., now under the jurisdiction of RFC.

#### COMMISSION TO REGULATE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION WITHIN THE METROPOLITAN AREA OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill by Gerald J. Glassman, who is executive assistant, Arlington County Public Utilities Commission, and secretary, Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Committee, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 922) to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The explanation of the bill is as follows:

#### EXPLANATION OF BILL BY GERALD J. GLASSMAN, WHO IS EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT, ARLINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION; SECRETARY, WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Since the end of World War II, transit service in the Washington metropolitan area has been deteriorating, fares have been increasing, and patronage declining. The effects on the economy of the metropolitan area have been very serious: ever-increasing traffic congestion slowing commerce, oppressive highway construction costs, Government recruitment difficulties, business uncertainty, and displacement.

The extensive committee hearings which led to the reporting out of S. 3296 followed many years of studies and inquiries which never resulted in effective action to prevent further deterioration of the situation.

The 4 major carriers in the area, and the total of 14 carriers, are now regulated by 4 separate regulatory agencies, 2 of them far removed geographically from the area. As a result of lack of jurisdiction, conflicts in jurisdiction, and lack of centralized responsibility for transit among these agencies, regulation over individual companies is largely ineffective, and regulation over through interstate movements which, with intra-District movements, make up the bulk of traffic, is totally lacking. As a result, operations of the transit carriers are separate, uncoordinated, and inefficient.

The area Commission created by S. 3296 will provide for centralized responsibility for regulation of interstate and intra-District transit movement. With exclusive control over carriers transporting passengers within the District of Columbia and interstate within the metropolitan area, this agency can take direct action to correct specific fare, service, and financial problems affecting the major portion of the traffic, and through cooperative action with the States or by its own authority over intrastate operations which materially affect its interstate regulation, establish an integrated, coordinated transit system throughout the metropolitan area.

Under the proposed bill as amended, commissioners will be appointed at large from the metropolitan area to emphasize their

area responsibility rather than responsibility to any particular political jurisdiction.

A major virtue of this proposal is that the creation of the Commission and its functioning may be immediately accomplished without the delays attendant on an interstate compact. Action among the States and the Congress to expand its powers to embrace other operations in the area may proceed while the Commission functions to prevent further decline of the transit industry.

There is little doubt that, while this action is an important progressive step, the problem of adequate metropolitan area transportation will require further action by the States and the Congress. The regulation and administration of traffic control, street utilization, and development, and parking among the three separate political jurisdictions warrant further attention, cooperation, and probably additional legislation by the Congress, Maryland, and Virginia. There can be no final solution of the overall problem, however, if the central portion, regulation of the transit industry, continues ineffective and impotent.

#### PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN A NATIONAL CELEBRATION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF CONTROLLED POWERED FLIGHT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, 50 years have passed since, at Kitty Hawk, the Wright brothers demonstrated to the world that controlled aerial flight was possible. Since that time, America has gone forward by leaps and bounds in aerial commerce. As the coauthor of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which act has brought stability and regularity of regulation to commercial aviation, I take a great deal of pride in now joining with the various aerial groups throughout the country by introducing a joint resolution to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight, occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953, and I ask that the joint resolution be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to provide for proper participation by the United States Government in a national celebration of the 50th anniversary year of controlled powered flight occurring during the year from December 17, 1952, to December 17, 1953, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### AMENDMENT OF SENATE AND HOUSE RULES REQUIRING BILLS AMENDING OR REPEALING STATUTORY PROVISIONS TO SHOW CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution which would require a change in the rules of the Senate and the House providing that each bill or resolution when it is printed, if it amends a statute, should contain a comparative print showing the part of the statute proposed to be amended.

I might mention that this is the practice which has always been followed in the Legislature of New York State, and I feel that such a procedure, if it were adopted by the two Houses of Congress, would greatly expedite our legislative work.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That subsection 1 of rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:*

"1. (a) Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day.

"(b) Any bill or joint resolution introduced in the Senate repealing or amending any statute or part thereof shall consist of a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by brackets or capital letters or other appropriate typographical devices as shall be determined by the Joint Committee on Printing the omissions and insertions proposed to be made."

Sec. 2. Subsection 3 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"3. (a) All other bills, memorials, and resolutions may, in like manner, be delivered, indorsed with the names of Members introducing them, to the Speaker, to be by him referred, and the titles and references thereof and of all bills, resolutions, and documents referred under the rules shall be entered on the Journal and printed in the Record of the next day, and correction in case of error of reference may be made by the House, without debate, in accordance with rule XI, on any day immediately after the reading of the Journal, by unanimous consent, or on motion of a committee claiming jurisdiction, or on the report of the committee to which the bill has been erroneously referred.

"(b) Any bill or joint resolution introduced in the House of Representatives repealing or amending any statute or part thereof shall consist of a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by brackets or capital letters or other appropriate typographical devices as shall be determined by the Joint Committee on Printing the omissions and insertions proposed to be made."

#### CHAPEL FACILITIES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MONRONEY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized and directed to make available a room, with facilities for prayer and meditation, for the use of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The architect shall maintain the prayer room for individual use rather than assemblies and he shall provide appropriate symbols of religious unity and freedom of worship.*

#### NAMING OF NAVAL VESSEL FOR THE LATE EUGENE ELY, OF DAVENPORT, IOWA

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 67), which was

referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

*Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is requested to name, as soon as possible, a naval vessel of the proper classification for the late Eugene Ely, of Davenport, Iowa, in recognition of the said Eugene Ely's contribution to naval aviation in making on January 18, 1911, the first landing and take-off by an airplane on a naval vessel at sea.*

#### EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH EMIGRATION OF REFUGEES FROM WESTERN EUROPEAN NATIONS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 68), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

*Resolved, That Senate Resolution 326 of the Eighty-second Congress, second session, relating to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to conduct a thorough and complete study, survey, and investigation of the problems in certain Western European nations created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny, is amended by striking out the word and figures, "April 30, 1953," on page 3, line 10, and inserting in lieu thereof the following word and figures: "April 30, 1954."*

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1, PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATIVE TO MAKING TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, February 18, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee by Monday, February 16, 1953, so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SCHOEPPPEL:

Address delivered by Senator MUNDT at the Kansas Day Banquet on the 92d anniversary of the admittance of Kansas to the Union, at Topeka, Kans.

Article entitled "Topeka Marine Officer Who Asked Combat Is Killed in Korea Action," published in the Topeka (Kans.) State Journal, February 3, 1953, concerning



the death in Korea of Marine Capt. Stanley Curyea.

Editorial entitled "Boost for Soil Conservation," published in the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital, February 9, regarding Senate bill to provide tax relief for farmers on account of soil and water conservation.

By Mr. BEALL:

Letter addressed by him to Lithuanian-American Information Center relating to observance of 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania.

By Mr. BARRETT (for Mr. GOLD-WATER):

Address delivered by Hon. Henry F. Ashurst before the Hassayampa Club at Los Angeles, Calif., August 18, 1910.

By Mr. YOUNG:

Address entitled "Wheat Faces Trouble Again," delivered by Roy F. Hendrickson, executive secretary, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, at the annual meeting of the National Association of Wheat Producers at Omaha, Nebr., on January 30, 1953.

Editorial dealing with the reporting of combat plane losses in Korea, published in the Jamestown (N. Dak.) Sun, of Tuesday, February 3, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Radio address delivered by Mr. Eric Sevareid on a CBS radio broadcast on February 11, 1953.

Article entitled "National Origin: Fraud and Threat," published in the New Republic of February 16, 1953.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Address delivered by Lewis K. Gough, national commander of the American Legion, on the occasion of the 19th annual pilgrimage to the Tomb of Abraham Lincoln, at Springfield, Ill., on February 12, 1953.

Article entitled "Needed: An Independent Tax-Collecting Agency," written by Mr. Carl T. Curtis and published in the January 1953 issue of Tax Review.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

Article entitled "Lafayette Native Works Wonders in Egypt," written by Robert C. Ruark, published recently in the Lafayette Advertiser, Lafayette, La.

By Mr. MORSE:

Text of radio program entitled "Jewish Life Program," broadcast over Station KPOJ, Portland, Ore., on January 11 and 18, 1953.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

Review of television program, It's Our Government, by Hal J. Miller, editor of the Government Standard.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

Article entitled "A New Tariff Idea," written by Jack T. Pickett, and published in the California Farmer for January 24, 1953.

#### PRICE DIFFERENTIAL MADE IN GOOD FAITH AS A COMPLETE DEFENSE TO CHARGE OF PRICE DISCRIMINATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have just received a letter from Albert A. Carretta dealing with the subject of my bill, Senate bill 540, which I introduced on January 21, 1953. I am sending the original of the letter to the Committee on the Judiciary with a request that it be incorporated in the committee files on Senate bill 540.

Because I believe the Members of the Senate will be interested in this matter, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Carretta's letter to me be now read by the clerk as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read the text of the letter to which the Senator from Nevada has referred.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,  
Washington, January 26, 1953.

Hon. PATRICK A. McCARRAN,  
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: I today obtained a copy of S. 540, introduced by you on January 21, 1953, entitled "A bill to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor."

I believe that the bill is a good one, and I am especially interested in the proviso at the end of the bill which states:

"That a seller shall not be deemed to have acted in good faith if he knew or should have known that the lower price or more extensive services or facilities which he met were in fact unlawful."

My interest stems from my review of a case which was recently decided by the Federal Trade Commission. I wrote a dissent in that case, and I am taking the liberty of forwarding to you a copy of the recent decision of the Commission in the matter of Standard Oil Co. (an Indiana corporation), as well as a copy of my dissenting opinion therein. I am frank to say that my most difficult problem in writing my dissent concerned the determination of what the Supreme Court of the United States meant in its opinion in the matter of *Standard Oil Company v. Federal Trade Commission* (January 8, 1951), when it apparently added the word "lawful" to the words of section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act, which sets forth the good-faith defense available to sellers. After much consideration, I arrived at the conclusion expressed in part II of my dissent, which begins on page 5. I invite your attention to this particular portion of my dissenting opinion, and especially to the two marked paragraphs on page 7. You will note that my conclusion is almost identical in language with that set forth in the proviso contained in S. 540.

In my opinion, enactment of this bill will go a long way toward clarifying, for businessmen and for the Federal Trade Commission, the intent of Congress relative to the good-faith defense which is available to sellers pursuant to the provisions of section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Very truly yours,

ALBERT A. CARRETTA.

#### PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF UTAH DESIGNATING FEBRUARY 1953 AS AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH IN UTAH

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a proclamation by the Governor of Utah, the Honorable J. Bracken Lee, designating February 1953 as American History Month in Utah.

This meritorious undertaking is the result of the initial efforts of Mrs. Otto A. Weisley, State chairman of Americanism for the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The program is receiving the cooperation of Utah's educational system, the newspapers, radio and television, churches, and civic and patriotic organizations.

At this period in world history when our Nation is threatened from without and within by foreign ideologies, it seems most fitting that a resurvey of Amer-

ican history should be undertaken. Nothing will preserve our great principles and individual freedoms and liberties more than a thorough knowledge by every American of the significance of his country's rich historical heritage.

I take great pride and pleasure in complimenting Mrs. Weisley, Governor Lee, and the other organizations in my State who are devoting their time and efforts to so worthy a cause.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATE OF UTAH,

Salt Lake City, January 17, 1953.

STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNOR OF UTAH

Over the years there has seemed to be a tendency to overlook or forget the motivations that prompted our forefathers to draft the Declaration of Independence, or the significance of the many events in American history.

A knowledge of American history is one of the best deterrents to the spread of the various isms seeking a foothold in our country that I know. Its importance should never be underestimated and its teaching always should be emphasized in our public institutions.

The Daughters of the American Revolution have been in the forefront of organizations endeavoring to promote greater patriotism among our people as well as to stamp out subversion wherever it is found.

In cooperation with the Daughters of the American Revolution, and with other groups cooperating in this and similar projects, I am designating the month of February as American History Month in Utah, and I urge all our people to give particular attention to observing the month appropriately throughout the State, and particularly in our schools, colleges, and university.

J. BRACKEN LEE,

Governor of Utah.

#### PARITY PRICES FOR FARMERS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for several minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Mississippi may proceed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I note from the public press that the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, spoke at the Central Livestock Association's annual meeting in St. Paul, Minn., a day or two ago and outlined his farm policies, and the farm policies of the Eisenhower administration.

Secretary Benson started his speech by stating:

The great crusade of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, now our President, is under way. You helped give him his mandate.

Mr. President, I submit that there were very few farmers in the United States who knew that they were giving the administration a mandate to reduce farm support prices, or that a great crusade was under way to pull the rug from under the farmers of the country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is my understanding, formed from the mail I have received from the farmers of South Carolina, that General Eisenhower, who is

now our President, stated that he would take the lead in support of 100 percent parity prices. That is the information my mail contains. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Mississippi on making his statement that there was no mandate given to provide the farmer disaster insurance instead of parity.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from South Carolina should realize that what was promised the American farmer was parity income. That was before the election. When, however, the officials of the Department of Agriculture came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, when their nominations were before that committee for confirmation, they said that was the objective, but that it would be reached away off in the future. They said the objective was to get parity income. Their statement merely meant that their promise was worth just as much as the statement that the objective of all of us is to be against sin, but the place where sin will be abolished is in Heaven, and it appears that the place where the farmer will get parity income, if the policies being pursued are followed, will be Heaven.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator from Mississippi will further yield, does he remember that when the officials were before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry they stated that their objective was to give the farmers parity income?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not want to be misunderstood by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who sits beside me, and who is the ranking member of the minority on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but I made the statement to the press yesterday that I was going to ask our colleague on the other side, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], to have the Secretary of Agriculture come before the Committee on Banking and Currency, not that that committee has jurisdiction over agricultural matters, but it does have jurisdiction over the Export-Import Bank and other international and farm banking organizations. I believe something constructive can be done, and I think it will be done, if the committee will look into the subject and take action to get the farm surpluses moving to where American farm products are needed.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator, and I agree with him. I shall cover in the remarks I am about to make the subject to which he has alluded. But the Senator from South Carolina certainly realizes that the very basis of justice to the farmer is parity-support prices. It is only by obtaining such prices that he will be able to get proper returns for his products.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In his speech the Secretary of Agriculture repeated what has been said frequently in recent days, that the farmer will get parity of income by obtaining 100-percent parity in the marketplace. When he couples that with the ominous statement he made,

that the price-support program should be used only as insurance against disaster, does not that indicate that what he intends to do if he has his way, is simply, so far as the farm program is concerned, to revert to the old system, so that when a bumper crop goes to market the only thing the farmer can do is to get the best price he can under the bumper-crop marketing conditions, which invariably will drive prices down?

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Alabama is exactly right. As I understood the whole theory of our price-support program, it was to secure for the farmer an adequate share of the national income.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And an orderly marketing opportunity.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know that that was the philosophy behind the program when Congress enacted the law.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I remind my good friend from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that in the Defense Production Act we urged the farmer to increase his production. We urged the cattlemen to raise more cattle, so that there would be surpluses which could be stored in the event of further disturbance, and which would also perhaps be a brake against inflation. However, it never was the thought of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] is a member, that the parity program was designed to be merely insurance against disaster. He addressed the Senate on that subject the other day. Parity is what the farmer is entitled to, and parity is what the farmer requested. Moreover, the farmer raised the cattle, planted the wheat, and raised the cotton. Now he is told that he is a stepchild waiting for "disaster."

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina certainly realizes that since the great crusade which the Secretary mentioned started, since the mandate was given, and since he says we have been on our way, all the profit has been squeezed out of agriculture. There has been one disastrous break after another on the commodity exchanges, until today there is depression and gloom in the agricultural areas of the country.

What is the farmer met with? He is met with the cry, "Market your product in an orderly way; there is nothing we can do." It is the same old cry we heard back in 1932, the only difference being that at that time there was added the statement that "Prosperity is just around the corner."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to join with the Senator from Mississippi in the major thesis which he rises on the floor of the Senate to present and defend. I ask him this question: Does he agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that the maintenance of a high potential surplus food power in the United States is an objective in which every man,

woman, and child in the country has a vital interest from the standpoint of maintaining a high standard of living for all of us?

Mr. EASTLAND. I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from Oregon; and I believe that maintaining a food stockpile is more important to this country than the stockpile of metals which we have accumulated under our stockpiling program.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Mississippi agree with me that, as we read history, we find that whenever a civilization starts a "break even" program in connection with food supply, or finds itself in a position in which the agricultural population are economically depressed, that civilization starts to decline?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is exactly right.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator believe that Mr. Benson is carrying out the 1952 Republican platform?

Mr. EASTLAND. Frankly, I do not know what the Republican platform says.

Mr. LANGER. I have it before me.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know that the policies which the Secretary announced were not the farm policies advocated by the President of the United States before the election.

Mr. LANGER. Let me read to the distinguished Senator a portion of the Republican platform, found on page 75 of the pamphlet entitled "Factual Campaign Information":

We favor a farm program aimed at full parity prices for all farm products in the marketplace.

Is not that what Mr. Benson is doing? Why should the distinguished Senator object? The people of the United States voted for this platform.

Mr. EASTLAND. For the simple reason that the only way in which the farmer can receive such prices is through support prices. It is the policy to reduce such support prices. If they are reduced to 60 percent, the price of wheat will fall to 60 percent of parity. If they are reduced to 70 percent, it means that the price of wheat will fall to 70 percent of parity. The only way to make valid the pledge which the Senator read is to assure the farmer a Government-guaranteed price through support prices which will give him parity income.

Mr. LANGER. I agree with my distinguished friend. I stand foursquare for 100-percent parity. I am not criticizing what he is doing, but I am calling attention to the fact that the line-and-a-half read by me is in the Republican platform.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me long enough to permit me to ask the Senator from North Dakota a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am glad to yield, if I may do so without losing the floor.



Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Oregon for the purpose of asking a question of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], without my losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from North Dakota, who has referred to the Republican plank on agriculture, if he supported that plank in the late campaign?

Mr. LANGER. I did not support that plank in the late campaign. As a matter of fact, I went all over North Dakota and warned the farmers of North Dakota that that plank was dangerous. I told them that the Republican presidential candidate could not change that plank, even though he said he was in favor of 90 or 100 percent of parity at Kasson, Minn. I told the farmers that the President was bound by that line and a half in the Republican platform. Some of the very persons who are now criticizing the President and criticizing Mr. Benson were at the Republican convention, but did not appear before the platform committee, which was headed by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], to support either the 90- or 100-percent plank for agriculture. Had they done so that portion of the Republican platform might have been entirely different.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I quote from the statement by Secretary Benson—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask one further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me continue for a moment longer, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Secretary Benson said:

I welcome this opportunity to come to this great agricultural area of the Nation and personally report on progress.

Mr. President, I submit that the farmers of the United States have given the administration no mandate to reduce support prices. The "progress" referred to by Mr. Benson has destroyed the foundation of agricultural prosperity in this country.

The Secretary further stated during the course of his speech that—

Farm price support should provide insurance against disaster to the farm-producing plant and help to stabilize national food supplies.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator interpret that statement to mean that the farmer must be the victim of a disastrous condition before he can obtain the loan, to which he is entitled, on his wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, or whatever his product may be, despite the fact that the Government of the United States, under the Defense Production Act, enacted by Republicans and Democrats alike, urged that the farmers increase their crop production?

Mr. EASTLAND. Evidently the Secretary plainly meant that there would be low support prices.

Mr. MAYBANK. Those would be disaster prices.

Mr. EASTLAND. Evidently he meant that there would be low support prices which would prevent the bottom from falling out of the commodity market.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did he not use the word "disaster"?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly. He stated that the purpose was to prevent disaster. In other words, instead of a support price of 32 cents a pound on cotton, it was made about 20 cents a pound.

Mr. MAYBANK. That would be "disaster."

Mr. EASTLAND. The support price on wheat was approximately cut in half. The theory of the American Congress was that there should be support prices to assure the farmer a profitable price in the market place.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It appears now that the "profitable price in the market place" means a disaster price. What I want the Record to show is that the Secretary says support will be provided only when prices are disastrously low. That would be even worse than the "peril point" we have fought so hard. Is that the Senator's interpretation?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is my interpretation.

Mr. President, the statement of Secretary Benson is at variance with what the Congress intended in enacting the price-support laws, and it is at variance with what American agriculture thought and believed was the purpose of the farm program. As I had always understood, the parity concept, of which the price-support program is only the administrative part, was designed to give the farmers their equitable share of the national income.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. EASTLAND. In a moment.

Of course, it was disaster insurance; but the basic reason for support prices of 90 percent of parity was to assure the producers of basic agricultural commodities that they would receive their just and equitable share of the national income. Price supports are the only feasible and effective way to assure agriculture its just share of the national income. Adequate price supports are the only sure way to make certain that the farmer will receive economic justice. I submit that the farmers of the country have given no mandate, and have not intentionally participated in any crusade which would reduce their just income or standard of living, as is certain to happen if the present price-support statute is not continued for next year.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to tell the Senator from Mississippi what the word "disaster" means to me. It was my understanding of the meaning of the word which impelled me to vote for the continuation of RFC. I note that the former Administrator of RFC, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is on the

floor. A disaster loan is granted by the RFC when a community, for example, has been totally obliterated by flood or by hurricane or some other tragedy. A disaster loan is not the same as an ordinary loan. I hope the Senator from Mississippi will make clear in the Record what disaster loans mean under the legislation passed by Congress through the years. It was passed in connection with RFC legislation, under which a community had to show distress because of a disaster and in connection with the Agriculture Act under which the crops of a given area were either totally or nearly destroyed for one reason or another. These, Mr. President, are the terms of disaster. And that is what the Secretary of Agriculture is going to bring to the farmer.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I gather from what the Senator from Mississippi is saying he feels it is necessary that we take some steps immediately to keep farm prices from going down, down, and down. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is certainly one of the features of what I am saying.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the prices on the basic farm commodities continue to go down, what does the Senator from Mississippi believe will happen to the economy of all America?

Mr. EASTLAND. We are headed for disaster, of course. Farm prosperity comes first always.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not correct to say that we have always found, in every depression, that the first thing that happens is that the prices of the basic commodities go down?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And that immediately thereafter the storekeeper cannot sell his goods?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And then the effect is felt by every segment of our economy.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And the economy eventually gets to where we found it in 1932. Is that not correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. I wish to point out to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that it is the fundamental philosophy of some people that prosperity must seep down from the top to the bottom. That philosophy will bring disaster today as quickly as it brought it in the 1930-32 period.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to a headline which appeared on the front page of the Washington Post of yesterday. It reads "Benson Spells Doom of United States Farm Bounty." In that connection, Representative GATHINGS pointed out on the floor of the House yesterday that the figures recently released by the Commodity Credit Corporation show that from all

operations with respect to the basic commodities, from the inception of the program in 1933 through December 31, 1952, there was a net gain in profit in the amount of \$113,000,000, and on cotton last year there was a net profit of \$238,000,000.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is familiar with those figures?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Does that fact not point out that misleading information is being given to the public, and does it not also point out that perhaps some officials of the Department of Agriculture do not yet have all the facts before them?

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator is saying is correct. I will show that a great deal of propaganda, to the effect that farmers are losing their freedom with a 90-percent support price, is being put forth, when the truth is that the farmer is freer today than he ever was. Formerly, in the depression days, he was the slave of the banker.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Mississippi, I am sure, has in mind the statement which President Eisenhower made in his state of the Union message, to the effect that the welfare of the farmer was dependent upon the welfare of the Nation. Does not the distinguished Senator from Mississippi agree with me that the President's statement is the reverse of the fact, and that the stability of the Nation is fundamentally dependent upon the welfare of the producer of the raw materials?

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator is correct. It is a fundamental principle of economics that when the farmer cannot buy, the wheels of industry cannot turn.

Mr. GILLETTE. Supplementing the question which was asked by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], is there anything more unfortunate than the designation of the Nation's policies with respect to support prices on agriculture as disaster insurance? Is it not the concept of Congress that through the support-price program and through the system by which we utilize support prices, we are offering stability to farmers?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly.

Mr. GILLETTE. And that Congress did not intend support prices to be considered merely as insurance to be paid after a disaster has occurred.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator says is exactly correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. The intention of Congress was to protect the farmer from disaster.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. That was the congressional intent.

Mr. President, the Democratic Party, after the Hoover debacle of 1930-32, promised—

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted to ask the Senator one question. Does he have a copy of the complete text of Mr. Ben-

son's speech? I have been unable to get a copy of it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. I shall be glad to send a copy of it to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I would appreciate having a copy of it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Democratic Party, after the Hoover debacle of 1930-32, promised agriculture a better day and promised and enacted legislation which has made agriculture prosperous. Farm price supports were finally fixed at 90 percent instead of 100 percent of parity because it was recognized that it was to the farmers' interest to maintain the commodity exchanges and the agricultural marketing system and it was thought, and soundly so, that by fixing the support prices at 90 percent instead of 100 percent, the exchanges could function normally. When cotton was much cheaper in proportion to other basic farm commodities, the support price on cotton was fixed at 95 percent of parity to bring the price level of this commodity in line with prevailing prices on wheat, corn, and other basic agricultural crops. This worked well.

Today agriculture is caught in a squeeze between high costs and falling farm prices. Depression and gloom prevail in the great farm areas of the Nation. Mr. President, the prosperity of the Nation is built upon agricultural prosperity. This country cannot long remain prosperous unless agriculture prospers. This Government, Mr. President, should be taking steps to increase farm prices instead of adopting a do-nothing, wait-and-see, Hoover attitude of placidly awaiting the catastrophe. Unless falling farm prices are halted, a major depression awaits this country. I submit that the first step should be to raise support prices from 90 percent to 95 percent of parity to partially compensate the farmer for his fantastically high costs.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi if he agrees with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] in this particular. I notice that the Senator from North Dakota is quoted as having said: "Some of us feel that President Eisenhower ought to remind the Secretary of his own campaign pledge to help farmers receive 100-percent parity, or at least increase it."

Mr. EASTLAND. I certainly agree with that statement of my distinguished friend from North Dakota. I usually agree with everything he says and usually agree with most of his votes. He is one of the soundest and ablest Senators in this body.

The Secretary of Agriculture went on to say:

But price supports which tend to prevent production shifts toward a balanced supply in terms of demand and which encourage uneconomic production and result in continuing heavy surpluses and subsidies should be avoided. Our effort should be to reorient our present national policies and programs so that they will contribute to the development of a prosperous and productive agriculture within our free enterprise system.

The Secretary stated that, in the administration of the Department of Agriculture, "the guiding purpose will be to strengthen individual integrity, freedom, and the very moral fiber of our citizens."

Mr. President, why the inferential assault on the price-support program? Why the talk of flexible price supports? Why all the bugaboo of uneconomic production, freezing acreage, and picking faults with the present law? Is it because next year the Department of Agriculture will oppose the renewal of the present price-support law? There is no doubt but that it is their intention. If this happens, it will deprive the farmer and the Nation of the most beneficial act ever passed for agriculture. By maintaining farm purchasing power, the price-support program has stabilized our entire economy. I submit that because of high costs, it is now inadequate and should be increased at once. The minimum should be 95 percent.

What are the facts? Is the objection to fixed price supports well taken? Is the claim that it will freeze production in uneconomic areas valid? There has been a tremendous shift in the production of rice into new areas. Mr. President, there has been a tremendous shift in the production of cotton to the far western States. We have seen a tremendous increase in cattle population in the southern States, until today the Old South is one of the leading livestock producing areas of the Nation. History shows that high farm-commodity prices, instead of freezing production in uneconomic producing areas, actually encourage the shifting of production to new areas. Prosperous crop prices are an incentive to other areas to produce a new commodity. If prices are not high and the reward not great, they will not go into a new business. The producer will not take a chance on untried crops involving new hazards. When prices are low and times hard, there is no shift or expansion of areas of production. Had it not been for the price of cattle which prevailed until the past few months, this industry would not have expanded into the South. Had it not been for cotton at 40 cents a pound, the cotton industry would not have expanded so greatly into the farm western States. There would be no incentive to invest in new equipment and new tools to venture into new fields in which a farmer did not have the knowledge that experience gives.

In fact, this country in the past 8 years, and under the present price-support program, has seen the greatest shift in agricultural production ever witnessed at any time in the history of the Nation.

The further charge is laid against the present Price Support Act that 90 percent inflexible support prices will deprive the farmer of his personal liberty and will make him a ward of the State; and then those who oppose 90 percent of parity make the trite and oft-repeated statement that the farmer must be a free man. What are the facts? We have had support prices of 90 percent of parity for a number of years. When was the farmer ever freer than he is today? When has his freedom been in the least curtailed? When was he ever freer and more independent of his Government than he is today? When was he ever



freer of his bank and lending agencies than he is today? Except where speculation enters, the farmers of this country owe less money and are less dependent upon the lending agencies than at any time since the Civil War. The point is that the present price-support law is responsible for that situation, Mr. President. Today the farmer enjoys the highest prosperity he has ever experienced in the history of the United States. He is free and is more independent than he has ever been.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true, also, that employment in the United States is at its highest peak and factory wages are at their highest peak?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; because of farm prosperity.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the present law has worked well. Farm-support prices prevented a depression at the close of World War II. They have greatly benefited the entire economy of the country because they have given agriculture purchasing power.

I know that many persons sincerely oppose extension of the present law, and I believe the present Secretary of Agriculture is a sincere and honest man. He is a very able man, and I have a great deal of respect for him. He has stated that he will not pull the rug from under the farmer. I know that to do so is not his intention, but nevertheless it will surely happen if the present law is not extended and if support prices are not raised to 95 percent of parity, to help the farmer meet his increased costs during this critical time of readjustment.

Do not let us delude ourselves, Mr. President. Flexible support prices will reduce agricultural purchasing power; they will be a backward step. They will injure agriculture, and they can accomplish no possible good. As a rule the consumer gets no benefit when farm prices go down. This condition usually swells the profits of the middleman and the processor. A 60-percent support price for basic agricultural commodities will mean that prices will be reduced to 60 percent of parity. A support price of 70 percent will mean that the prices of basic agricultural commodities will sink to 70 percent of parity. This drop in income will effect the entire American economy, because when the farmers' purchasing power is reduced, he certainly cannot buy the products of American industry.

American farmers have been the stabilizing influence in this country. Within the past few years the American farmers' influence has prevented the passage of much radical legislation. In fact, American agriculture is politically the largest and most powerful of any conservative group in this country; and I speak as a southern conservative. Agriculture is the core of American conservatism. Mr. President, the one sure way to destroy the conservative influences

in the Nation and set us on the road to socialism is to alienate the American farmer. I fear what will happen in this country if the American farmer is permitted to sink once again into poverty.

Mr. President, in my judgment, our farm policy must be to maintain the present price-support law; but, in addition, governmental machinery must be set up to assist private enterprise in exporting surplus farm products. After all, the maintenance of profitable markets is basic in any business or industry. I do not now think, and have never thought, that the present program of controlling agricultural surpluses by simply reducing acreage was sound and feasible. The weakness of acreage reduction to control surpluses is, where will it all end? Shall we continue to reduce acreage until we grow only enough cotton for American mills; only enough American pork and butter for American tables; only enough food to meet our own requirements, and abdicate our duty to furnish some of our abundance to the world? If our present policies continue, that seems to be the ultimate objective.

However, Mr. President, I recognize there should be the power in an emergency to impose acreage controls by the farmers themselves; but the most important thing is to sell surplus production and have it consumed in international trade. Surpluses should not be a drug on the market. On the contrary, if agricultural surpluses are properly handled, they are a blessing for our country. I think the promise of Secretary Benson to encourage foreign trade, which can be done, is fundamental to this whole question.

There should be a removal of trade barriers to such an extent as to enable us to market our surpluses and partially alleviate the want of the world. Necessity is a great master. I have always thought, and I now think, that the sure way to bring about an expansion of American agricultural exports is to create a crisis by a big surplus which will force us to act to open export outlets.

Mr. President, foreign trade is the key to the future of the United States and of the entire non-Communist world. It would be impossible for us to play into the hands of Moscow more completely than by isolating ourselves economically from the rest of the world. There is abroad a deep suspicion of our intentions. There is a historically justifiable suspicion of the trade policies of the Republican Party at home and abroad. Secretary Dulles is a witness to that statement, as evidenced by his speech last night.

I know that foreign nations must doubt our intentions when on yesterday practically every important man in the Government and the leaders of the Republican majority in Congress called at the White House to confer with the President on whether or not he should approve or disapprove a pewee, picayunish increase in tariff duties on briar pipes. As I understand, part of this industry, which is a hothouse industry that grew up after the war, desires to shut off the \$340,000 worth of briar pipes a year that we purchase, three-fourths from Italy and one-fourth from France.

Here, the United States, the most powerful industrial Nation in the history of the world, with an industrial machine which we boast is the most efficient on which the sun has ever shone with a man-hour production of American labor which is today the greatest in the history of the world, with the United States the greatest creditor Nation in the history of the world, and yet the administration is in a state of paralyzed tension, to plagiarize President Eisenhower's expression, at the prospect of a little foreign commerce that might compete in some insignificant way with this strong giant of an American industrial machine.

We must live, associate with, and do business with the world. We are a member of the community of the free nations of the world. We have welded an anti-Communist bloc. It is basic that political alliances, international friendships, military alliances, and all forms of mutual-protection treaties must be based upon international commerce. This is the line between isolationism and the building of an international community of free anti-Communist nations. There is no middle ground. I submit, Mr. President, that we cannot meet our moral obligations as the leader of the anti-Communist bloc unless we trade extensively with other nations of the world.

It is my candid judgment that the decision which the President of the United States makes on tariff increases, in the present matter and in others which will confront him, constitutes the most important step which he will have to take during his administration. There are no steps which are fraught with more peril or which will mean more for the future of the world and the free nations of the West than the trade policies of the United States. I am certainly apprehensive, and I know men of good will in every part of the Western World must be apprehensive that, on the little \$340,000 matter of the importation of briar pipes, before a decision could be made by the President, he had to call in the Mutual Security Director of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Under Secretary of State, and, in addition, a number of Assistant Secretaries. Why, we have there a good part of the Cabinet of the United States, and, in addition, we have the majority leader of the Senate, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and other influential Senators and Representatives. They are all lined up to see whether a few briar pipes could be imported into the United States. If the importation of such a small, picayunish item as a few briar pipes creates so much consternation, what does it portend for the major issues in international trade, Mr. President? Foreign countries will know that the renewal of our reciprocal trade agreements program is but an idle gesture if there is hesitation in the picayunish matter of a sackful of briar pipes.

Mr. President, Western Europe, Britain, and Japan are primarily industrial. They do not produce the food for their populations, or the fiber and the raw materials for their industries. In the case

of Western Europe, food and raw materials have historically come largely from eastern and southeastern Europe. Japan's food and raw materials have come from Korea, Manchuria, China, and the rest of the Asiatic Continent, now in ferment. These nations, our allies, cannot survive unless they secure most of their food, fiber, and raw materials from the Western World and from the United States. The position of Italy, Germany, and Japan is particularly hopeless unless there is an expansion of their trade with the dollar areas. If America's political leadership does not meet this test in a statesmanlike manner and serve our own enlightened self-interest by liberalizing our trade policies, then these countries must, of necessity, orient themselves toward the Communist bloc. In addition, Western Europe and Japan have lost their historic major markets for their industrial goods, which markets are now the countries within the Communist orbit.

Economic assistance cannot last much longer, and if food, fiber, raw materials, and markets are not available in the Western World to the western have-not nations, then there is no power on earth strong enough to prevent them from orienting themselves toward the Communist east.

Mr. President, because Western Europe and Japan have lost their trade relations with the eastern areas, now Communist, which historically furnished their food supply, a situation is created which gives American agriculture an unparalleled opportunity to enter these markets and enjoy the highest level of prosperity which we have ever enjoyed. This is a sound prosperity, a permanent prosperity. There is no need for farm surpluses to pile up if we will but trade. We can either supply the food and raw material requirements of our allied western nations by trade, or these requirements will be supplied by Moscow. There is no alternative. What would the Atlantic Pact be worth; what would any mutual security alliance be worth, if our western allies or Japan were forced to depend on Moscow for their food, their raw materials, or on Russia as a market for their goods? If this happens, then the billions of dollars we have spent abroad have gone down the drain, and all the sacrifices of the American people will have been in vain—all to placate unreasonable and unfounded fears by certain segments of American business.

Again I say, there can be only one course for the United States. We must remove trade barriers, reduce tariffs, and expand foreign trade. No farm program in this country can be successful without it. Without it the future lot of agriculture is poverty. Mr. President, I shall certainly cooperate with President Eisenhower where I possibly can, but I have a deathly fear that the policies of the administration will dry up and stagnate the flow of world trade.

I have heard that the briar-pipe matter will be referred to the Tariff Commission for further study. I do not know whether this is true or not, but if we are not to turn the clock back to the trade policies of McKinley and Smoot-Hawley, why this hesitation? If there

is hesitation and equivocation on the importation of an insignificant amount of goods, our Government certainly does not intend to liberalize trade to enable this country to build a sound prosperity which can only come in a prosperous community of western nations. High protection, import embargoes, and isolation are as out of date in this world, Mr. President, as are hoop skirts and saddle bags. If there are hesitation and equivocation now, it is useless to renew the reciprocal trade agreements program. No international agreements would be negotiated; no trade barriers reduced. Nothing would possibly be accomplished. The United States is at the crossroads. We are strong and powerful. Our industrial machine is unmatched. We have nothing to fear. This great Nation must continue as the leader of the free world. We must welcome trade. We must remove trade barriers between ourselves and other nations. If we do not do this, Mr. President, but instead act as we are doing on the briar-pipe matter, seclude ourselves, we will be just as isolated, friendless, and endangered in the world as we would be if Russian influence predominated in Western Europe and Japan. If we do not trade freely with them Russia will. We have no other choice.

And so the great crusade is on. Look where it is leading. One disastrous break follows another on the commodity exchanges. Since the beginning of the crusade farm commodities have sunk so low that all the profit has been squeezed out of farm and livestock production until today agriculture is in a critical and chaotic condition, and what do we hear? The echo of everything that was said 20 years ago except the statement that prosperity is just around the corner. Falling farm prices can be stopped by the powers that be anytime they take the steps to do it. The basis must be a support price of 95 percent of parity and a little economic engineering to open gateways in the tariff wall.

President Eisenhower is the leader of the free world. He is a real leader; he is a strong man. Without him all is lost. I commend his action up to now, but I am disappointed that we are embarking, from all appearances, on old-line Republican trade and farm policies, which, if not rectified, will bring disaster to us all.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from Mississippi a moment ago for a copy of Mr. Benson's speech. I received a copy, by special messenger, a moment ago. I have not had time to read it, but I ask unanimous consent that the speech delivered by Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, before the annual meeting of the Central Livestock Association, Inc., at St. Paul, Minn., on February 11, 1953, be inserted in the Record immediately following the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Utah is inserting Secretary Benson's speech. I had intended to insert it if the Senator did not.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### PROGRESS AND NEW HOPE FOR THE NATION

You confer upon me a signal honor and challenging responsibility by inviting me to speak at this great 32d annual convention of your association. The honor carries with it a grave obligation which, in view of national and world conditions, is almost overwhelming.

I congratulate you men and women of the soil, that from your number have come such stalwarts as Senator EDWARD J. THYE and other great leaders whom I might mention, many of whom are here tonight, and who are of the same solid stuff.

At the outset, I venture the assertion that no group in agriculture is in a position to recognize more clearly the needs of the agricultural industry and the Nation than this group who represent the men and women who live on the farms and ranches of the northwest. As one who has been reared among farmers, served them, and been served by them, I declare without fear of successful contradiction that our rural people are today the strongest bulwark we have against all that is aimed, not only at weakening, but at the very destruction of our American way of life.

It is gratifying to note that in recent years an increasing number of industrial, labor, political, and religious leaders have come to acknowledge this fact. It seems that man must get his feet into the soil to keep sane. In any event, no other segment of our population knows so well that "as ye sow, so shall ye reap." America and the world must learn this eternal truth. Failure to do so can bring only disappointment, suffering, and desperation.

Our rural people, men and women of faith and common sense, must plan an important part through their organizations in teaching this all-important lesson. From our rural families must come much of the faith, courage, and leadership to face effectively the local, State, national, and international problems of tomorrow.

As farm people, representing a most important part of our free enterprise system—our American way of life—do we have the courage to accept the challenge which faces our industry and the entire Nation? Will we recognize the facts and act promptly without quibbling? America must be kept strong if she is to preserve herself and provide effective world leadership. This strength must come not alone from armaments and military might. Her strength must be measured in the integrity, moral courage, and spirituality of her people.

Only a few weeks ago we exercised our God-given right of free agency at the polls. God grant we may never lose this priceless privilege. We have differed vigorously during a great political campaign, as is our privilege. But now the American people have freely spoken. We have chosen a President. He is our President. He needs, and will continue to need, our wholehearted support and our faith and prayers, as will his associates, in the difficult days ahead.

The great crusade of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, now our President, is underway. You helped give him mandate. I welcome this opportunity to come to this great agricultural area of the Nation and personally report on progress.

Important developments have come fast, yet only after solid and mature consideration. The pattern is emerging in a way to indicate the constructive approach with which your Federal Government will move forward.

The inauguration message and ceremonies inspired liberty-loving people everywhere. The state of the Union address was delivered to Congress February 2, less than 2 weeks following inauguration. Let us not lose



sight of our President's challenge to the Nation expressed in such statements as the following:

"Our immediate task is to chart a fiscal and economic policy that can \* \* \* reduce the planned deficits and then balance the budget, which means, among other things, reducing Federal expenditures to the safe minimum."

Look at these facts from the President's address:

Current year's budget deficit \$5.9 billion. Budget presented before this administration took office "indicates a budgetary deficit of \$9.9 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954."

"The national debt is now more than \$265 billion."

"In addition, the accumulated obligational authority of the Federal Government for future payment totals over \$80 billion."

"Even this amount is exclusive of large contingent liabilities, so numerous and extensive as to be almost beyond description \* \* \*"

"Permit me this one understatement," the President said. "To meet and to correct this situation will not be easy."

"Every department head and I are determined to do everything we can to resolve it."

"A balanced budget is an essential first measure in checking further depreciation in the buying power of the dollar."

"This is one of the critical steps to be taken to bring an end to planned inflation."

"Our purpose is to manage the Government's finances so as to help and not hinder each family in balancing its own budget."

An immediate review of all Federal budgets was called for by Joseph M. Dodge, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. His directive said:

"The problem is complicated by inheritance of the costs of a Federal debt of more than \$265 billion;

"Indicated deficits for the fiscal years 1953-54 totaling \$15.8 billion;

"With respect to personnel, it is the policy to reduce the number of Government employees."

"With respect to construction, it is the policy to proceed only with those projects which are deemed clearly essential."

"With respect to all programs, it is the policy to operate at a minimum level of cost and expenditures."

As a member of the President's Cabinet and Secretary of one of the largest governmental departments, I have the duty and obligation to use my best efforts to help our President achieve these objectives. I have implicit confidence in his integrity of purpose. I believe in his program—and I know that you and your neighbors, along with solid citizens all across the Nation, want first of all a balanced national budget and a halt to inflation.

As the President has said, "This administration does not and cannot begin its task with a clean slate." The legacy handed to us is fraught with a conglomeration of the most complex and difficult problems.

There is no easy road to the accomplishment of turning America back from an era of unbalanced budgets, of free spending, of inflation, of taxation that had reached confiscatory levels, of giveaway Government programs that were steadily and surely undermining the moral and spiritual values of our people. But such a program is in keeping with the thrift and wise financial management that is so characteristic of the people of rural America.

The United States Department of Agriculture has acted without delay. We have already effected a regrouping of agencies for more effective administration. February 5 our staff and agency heads met to start immediately a complete review of all programs and budgets. We have a splendid staff in charge, and they are ready to give strong leadership in seeing that agriculture does its share in accomplishing a balanced budget.

It will be our effort to give even more prompt and efficient service to you and the agricultural interests of the Nation—and at less cost. We believe it can be done.

A drastic drop in cattle prices was in progress as we came into office. We know how much it has been costing your members, and we were grateful for the helpful letters, telegrams, and phone calls reporting conditions, offering suggestions, and expressing confidence.

The Department of Agriculture is your Department, and we are in Washington for the purpose of serving you and all other citizens of the United States. We want your advice and suggestions at all times.

We hope you approved of the steps taken to help stabilize the cattle markets.

January 28, just 7 days after taking the oath of office, I issued a statement pointing out that prices received by farmers have been moving downward slowly and irregularly for almost 2 years. The decline is about 12 percent from a year ago and 18 percent from the peak reached in February 1951. Prices paid by farmers, as measured by the parity index, have been substantially unchanged during this period, with the result that the net incomes of farmers have experienced a severe squeeze. These changes have been under way for many months. We inherited this situation.

Opinions differ as to the future course of prices to be received by farmers. Our analysis in the Department of Agriculture leads us to expect no major changes during the next several months, particularly in view of the continuing high level of consumer income.

We shall continue to use such price-supporting devices as are available to us when and if prices sag below the levels prescribed by the Congress.

The next day I released to the press a copy of this telegram to Gov. Dan Thornton, of Colorado:

"Am doing all possible to have OPS controls on meat removed. Have advised with the White House, Congress, farm groups, packers, stockyard people, and retailers. All I have learned confirms my earlier belief, expressed prior to my appointment, that OPS meat controls should be removed. In my official capacity, I reaffirm that stand. Removal of OPS compulsory grading of meat would be a good thing for all segments of the industry and the consuming public."

February 3 we followed through with a call upon producers to follow an orderly pattern of marketing.

At the same time, we urged processing and distribution agencies to develop a greater consumer demand for beef. Prices to consumers have been sharply reduced, which will in turn move more beef into consumption and help stabilize the market.

It was again pointed out that the United States economy is fundamentally strong.

Employment and incomes are higher than ever before. This promises more stability in cattle prices, particularly since reductions due this year in the supply of pork will bolster the market for cattle.

The rapid buildup in cattle numbers has pointed to a somewhat lower level of prices than in 1951 or 1952. Recent breaks appear to be an unordered and temporary over-adjustment to what should be a natural reaction to this increase in cattle numbers. We feel that a return to orderly marketing will check the price slide.

Uncertainty on the part of both buyers and sellers has contributed to an unwarranted pessimism. Disturbed by the price trends, many feeders have let their cattle go at half finish.

Compulsory grading required by OPS and the retention of price ceilings on beef have contributed to price declines. Leaders in the industry whom we consulted agreed that the removal of controls would in itself tend to strengthen cattle prices and stabilize markets.

You were undoubtedly pleased with the announcement that followed next day:

"In conformity with the policy set forth by the President in his message to the Congress, we are developing a program for the orderly decontrol of prices. We are taking action on the decontrol of a number of items before the end of the week. \* \* \* Decontrol of meat would also include lifting the compulsory grading requirement on beef and will eliminate price ceilings on pork, lamb, veal, and beef at all levels from the farmer through the retail store." The results are well known. We are all pleased.

I have said before, and I now repeat, that price-support programs now in effect or previously announced will be continued. This means price support for the wheat you will seed this spring at a level which will reflect a nationwide farm price of about \$2.21 per bushel. It means a support price for oats equal to 80 cents per bushel; for barley, \$1.24; for rye, \$1.43; and for flaxseed, \$3.79 per bushel. It means support for dairy products at prices which will be announced soon.

We have not been stampeded into ill-considered action by the price declines that have occurred during this past month, nor do we propose to be stampeded. The farm people of the country, I am convinced, should expect sound and constructive help from the Department of Agriculture, and that we propose to give them. There will be no blanket promises to embark on actions which we have neither the authority to invoke nor the means to implement. You, on your part, can contribute stability to farm prices by orderly marketing and an exhibition of confidence and cooperation.

As we move forward, advisory groups and committees will be used to bring to the Department of Agriculture the best judgments of farmers, farm organizations, and industrial leadership.

The 14-man advisory committee named by the President to work with the Secretary of Agriculture gave us a good start. This committee, changed somewhat in personnel, will be meeting from time to time to review progress and make additional suggestions.

For the International Wheat Agreement Conference of 46 nations now meeting in Washington, we are using two advisory groups. One is composed of representatives of the major farm organizations and the wheat industry. The other is a joint committee from the Senate and House of Representatives.

A special dairy advisory group will meet next week in Washington to bring to bear on the many dairy problems the best judgments available. They are the best men we could find, men recommended by the industry itself. This great dairy area will be well represented.

A large cotton committee drawn from all major segments of the cotton industry is also ready to start work. A group of capable, highly respected citizens is being appointed to advise us in the important operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Other committees will be called as important problems develop and as work proceeds on major programs. We are willing to submit our case to the farmers. A lifetime of working for and with them, in all their fields of economic endeavor, has convinced us of our trust.

It will always be a definite part of our policy to seek the best possible advice from Members of the Congress and the entire agricultural industry through conferences with farm organization leaders, other advisory committees, and individuals regarding existing and proposed policies and programs. As the President emphasized in his state of the Union message: "This administration does not and cannot begin its task with a clean slate." Certainly in no area of the legacy handed us by the out-going administration are the problems more numerous or more difficult than in the Department of Agriculture.

The numerous programs and great decisions for which the Secretary of Agriculture has been given responsibility are almost unbelievable. The magnitude and import of the decisions he is required to make are humbling indeed, if not overwhelming. The Congress, through bipartisan legislation aimed to benefit agriculture, has provided far-reaching machinery pertaining to farm credit, research, marketing, and price supports.

It is our duty to administer faithfully these laws, not alone for the protection of the farmers, but for the good of all the people. We are firm in our resolve to do this. There will be no turning back from this responsibility. But as we administer these laws, there will be a thorough examination and reappraisal of each program. These efforts will be made in close cooperation and with advice from farmers and other qualified representatives of the industry. In other words, we want each commodity group to help develop a program it can make work with our help. We know that without the help of the industry and the blessings of a kind Providence, we cannot succeed. We are earnestly seeking both.

And now I would like to spell out for you, in broad outline, what will be the policy of our administration of your Department of Agriculture. It is the result of careful and prolonged deliberation in consultation with farmers, farm leaders, professional agriculturalists, Members of Congress, and others. I feel sure it is not perfect, because it has been developed by imperfect human beings. No doubt the policy will be refined and improved with the passing of time.

It has been influenced to some extent, no doubt, by an old-fashioned philosophy that it is impossible to help people permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves. It is a philosophy that believes in the supreme worth of the individual as a free man, as a child of God, that believes in the dignity of labor and the conviction that you cannot build character by taking away man's initiative and independence. And, further, that character is the one thing we make in this world and take with us into the next. For what doth it profit if we gain the whole world and lose our own souls?

I believe that the people who live on the farms and in the rural communities of America also accept this homely philosophy. I am most anxious that they will always accept it as a dynamic part of their lives. It must be so if this choice land of America is to endure.

This, then, in part at least, will be the broad policy which will guide us. I hope you will concur wholeheartedly.

#### AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

The supreme test of any Government policy, agricultural or other, should be "How will it affect the character, morale, and well-being of our people?" We need—the world needs—a strong America in the critical years ahead.

To me, freedom is a God-given, eternal principle vouchsafed to us under the Constitution. It must be continually guarded as something more precious than life itself. It is doubtful if any man can be politically free who depends upon the state for sustenance. A completely planned and subsidized economy weakens initiative, discourages industry, destroys character, and demoralizes the people.

With the development of mechanized commercial agriculture, the family farm has become closely geared into a complex interdependent industrial economy. There is no hope for peace, growth, or prosperity if each economic group is seeking its own advantage to the detriment of others. To make their best contribution to national welfare, farmers must have the full cooperation of industry and labor, because each is dependent upon the effective performance of the other economic groups.

Our agricultural policy should aim to obtain, in the market place, full parity prices of farm products and parity incomes for farm people so that farmers will have freedom to operate efficiently and to adjust their production to changing consumer demands in an expanding economy. This objective cannot be assured by Government programs alone. It can be achieved only with a steady level of prices, high employment and production, and rising output per worker in our total national economy.

The most important method of promoting the long-time welfare of farm people and the Nation is the support of adequate programs of research and education in the production, processing, marketing, and utilization of farm products and in problems of rural living.

The development of modern agriculture, which has made possible these great achievements, has placed the family farm in a vulnerable economic position because farm prices and income rise and fall more rapidly than farm costs. Hence, the guarding of farm levels of living requires a program of storage and price supports to help to assure stability of income. These supports should be designed not only to serve the welfare of farmers, but also—in the widest national interest—to prevent disaster to the farm-producing plant and the national food supply.

Price support laws will be carried out faithfully in every respect. There are mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity on the so-called basic commodities for 1953 and 1954. Other laws provide for supports on other farm products. While enforcing these laws, there will be formulated long-term programs which will more fully and effectively accomplish our overall objectives.

Price supports should provide insurance against disaster to the farm-producing plant and help to stabilize national food supplies. But price supports which tend to prevent production shifts toward a balanced supply in terms of demand and which encourage uneconomic production and result in continuing heavy surpluses and subsidies should be avoided. Our efforts should be to reorient our present national policies and programs so that they will contribute to the development of a prosperous and productive agriculture within our free enterprise system.

It is generally agreed that there is danger in the undue concentration of power in the Federal Government. Too many Americans today are calling on Washington to do for them what they should be willing to do for themselves.

Individual freedom and citizenship responsibility depend upon the principle of helping the individual to help himself. It is possible through individual and group action to solve many problems and achieve objectives locally with a minimum of Federal assistance and control. Your own association is an excellent example of this fact.

The principles of economic freedom are applicable to farm problems. We seek a minimum of restrictions on farm production and marketing to permit the maximum of dependence on free-market prices as the best guides to production and consumption. Farmers should not be placed in a position of working for Government bounty rather than producing for a free market. However, the ability to avoid restrictions on agriculture depends in part on the willingness of other economic groups to adopt policies that permit flexible and dynamic adjustments.

Furthermore, inefficiency should not be subsidized in agriculture or any other segment of our economy. Relief programs should be operated as such—not as an aid to the entire agricultural industry. Emergency programs should be terminated as soon as the emergency is over.

No agricultural program should be manipulated to serve partisan political purposes.

In the administration of this Department, the guiding purpose will be to strengthen the individual integrity, freedom, and the very moral fiber of each citizen. We must establish a climate which will further promote, cultivate, and release the great reservoir of dynamic latent energy of every individual in this great Nation.

The days ahead are sobering and challenging and will demand the faith, prayers, and loyalty of every American. Our challenge is to keep America strong—strong socially, economically, and, above all, spiritually sound, if our way of life is to endure. There is no other way. Only in this course is there safety for our Nation.

We need a nationwide repentance to rid this land of corruption. We must return to the fundamental virtues that have made this Nation great. There is a force in the universe which no mortal can alter. This Nation does have a spiritual foundation. It has been established in keeping with great spiritual and moral principles, but there seems to be a tendency for us to lose our sense of uprightness and to willfully do those things which we must know to be wrong. This cannot continue with impunity.

God help us to raise our sights beyond the dollar sign, beyond material things. May we have the courage to stand up and be counted, to stand for principle, for those noble concepts and ideals which guided the founding fathers in the establishment of this great land. Thank God for the promises that have been made regarding the future of America. I hope and pray we will merit and realize the fulfillment of these promises. God grant it may be so.

#### ATTITUDE OF ADMINISTRATION TOWARD THE PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. CLEMENTS subsequently said: Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] issued a statement yesterday in which he expressed his indignation at the new administration's attitude toward the price-support program. I ask unanimous consent that the statement issued by the Senator from Montana be placed in the Record following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION'S STAND ON PRICE SUPPORTS "SHOCKING"—"INSULT TO NATION'S FARMERS," MONTANA SENATOR DECLARES—"TALK OF AGRICULTURAL SURPLUS WHILE MILLIONS STARVE IS ABSURD," SENATOR MURRAY MAINTAINS—"NEW AGRICULTURE POLICY THREATENS RETURN TO FARM POVERTY OF 1920'S WITH FARMER COMPLETELY AT THE MERCY OF BIG CITY SPECULATORS IN HUNGER"

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, whose constituents produce much of the Nation's beef, lamb, and wheat, expressed himself as "shocked" by the new policy on price supports announced yesterday by Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture under the Eisenhower administration.

"It is obvious," Senator MURRAY declared, "that Mr. Benson either has no understanding at all of the measures which brought prosperity to America's farmers and an adequate supply of food to city dwellers or that, for reasons which I cannot grasp, he deliberately intends to return American agriculture to the chaos of the 1920's when our ranchers and farmers were completely at the mercy of big city, commodity market, speculators in human hunger."

"To say that price supports should be used only as 'disaster insurance' is an invitation to disaster," Senator MURRAY said. "To talk



of surpluses when millions of people in Europe, Asia, and Africa are undernourished or even starving is absurd—particularly so when we know that a properly planned distribution abroad of what Mr. Benson calls 'surpluses' will not only insure the continued prosperity of America's farmers but is also one of our greatest and least costly weapons against the spread of communism," the Montana Senator maintained.

"When Secretary Benson places price supports in the category of 'relief programs,' I believe he is insulting not only the intelligence but the integrity of America's most hard-working and most productive citizens. When he says that 'inefficiency should not be subsidized in agriculture,' I'd like to know just what groups of farmers or ranchers he is labeling inefficient. When he attempts to justify a refusal to maintain the democratic price support policy by implying that it has robbed the American farmer of character, initiative, and independence, the most charitable thing I can say is that Mr. Benson certainly hasn't met any of Montana's ranchers and farmers in recent years.

"Speaking for the people of Montana, I would advise Mr. Benson that thanks to agricultural policies he apparently intends to undermine, Montana's producers of beef and lamb, of wheat, and sugar beets—indeed, all the people of Montana—are independent, are men and women of character, and, if Mr. Benson doesn't promptly move to support farm prices, will surprise him by the initiative they show in replacing this administration by one which works for the interest of all our people rather than for the interests.

"The price-support program is our Government's guaranty to the American farmer that he will not suffer when he patriotically undertakes to produce the enormous quantities of food needed to keep ours the best fed army in the world, to keep our country the most productive in the world, and to offset the blandishments held out by Communist Russia to our friends abroad. The price-support program provides American agriculture with that stability which made it the most efficient in the world. Not only must the price-support program be maintained but the Congress must demand that President Eisenhower instruct his Secretary of Agriculture to promptly plan its extension beyond 1954 so that our farmers in turn may plan ahead. The alternative is a return to that insecurity, uncertainty, and potential bondage to the moneylenders which ruined America's farmers and its farm productivity in the twenties. I am positive that such an alternative will not be tolerated by the Congress. If this be the end of the new administration's honeymoon, so be it. It is far better to end the honeymoon than to end the farmer," Secretary MURRAY concluded.

#### VISIT TO THE SENATE BY 13 BEAUTY QUEENS FROM THE SOUTH

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the great State of Louisiana is famous for its diversified farming, its delicious foods, and also for its prowess in the production of oil, sulfur, salt, and other minerals; last, but not least, the State is well noted for its beautiful girls.

It is my privilege to present to the Senate 13 queens from the southland, 12 of whom hail from Louisiana and 1 from Texas. Texas is so close to Louisiana that she also produces girls who are almost as beautiful as the girls of Louisiana. As I read the names of the girls, I hope they will stand so that the Senators may see them.

Angle Branch, rice queen, Crowley (Houston); Gail Dugal, yambilee queen, Opelousas (Lafayette); Dorothy Etta Goff, peach queen, Ruston; Marian Hodges, mardi gras

queen, New Orleans; Barbera Huff, rose queen, Bogalusa; Carolyn Landry, dairy queen, Lafayette; Betty Rose Pigott, paper queen, Bogalusa; Patty Pope, holiday in Dixie queen, Shreveport; Janelle Roy, camellia queen, Lafayette; Jacqueline Sandifer, American Legion sweetheart, Bogalusa; Betty Lou Seabolt, forest queen, Winnfield; Sylvia Ann Segura, sugar queen, New Iberia; Mavis Sinetere, shrimp queen, Morgan City.

(As Mr. ELLENDER read their names, the young ladies rose from their seats in the gallery, and were greeted with applause by the Members of the Senate.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues for their warm reception of these fine young ladies. I am most proud of all of them. They hail from various parts of Louisiana and represent a fair cross section of my State. They will be in Washington for a few days and I wish for them the best of luck.

#### DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR ELBERT D. THOMAS, OF UTAH

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it is with profound regret and sorrow that I announce the death of our former colleague, the Honorable Elbert Duncan Thomas, at Honolulu on Wednesday, February 11.

Senator Thomas had been in Honolulu since his retirement from the United States Senate, serving as High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands taken from Japan during World War II.

I am sure the people of the State of Utah and the Nation, as well as the Members of this body, were shocked to hear of his death.

Although Senator Thomas and I were of opposite political parties and had different points of view, we nevertheless were friends and members of the same church. I visited him only a year ago in Honolulu at the offices of the High Commissioner. He appeared to be in excellent health and spirits.

Senator Elbert Thomas was a native of Salt Lake City. He attended public school in Salt Lake City, and received his bachelor of arts degree from the University of Utah. He held a doctor's degree from the University of California.

Senator Thomas had a remarkable and distinguished career and during its course he occupied many positions of trust and honor, both in his native State of Utah and in the Nation. He served in the Armed Forces of his country; as a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints in the Empire of Japan; as a professor at the University of Utah; as a United States Senator, and at numerous times as special representative of the United States in international activities.

Senator Thomas was a Member of this body for 18 years. He especially interested himself in labor and educational matters and in foreign affairs. During much of World War II he was acting chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, and was afterward chairman. He served as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and later as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Senator Thomas was a devoted husband and father. He is survived by his widow of his second marriage and by three married daughters.

Literally thousands of citizens of the State of Utah attended his classes when he was professor of political science at our State university. His educational and other activities were so numerous and so varied that I cannot do justice to all of them in the time permitted me this morning.

Mr. President, in my own behalf and in behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], I send to the desk a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 69) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Elbert Duncan Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Utah.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary transmit a copy of this resolution to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to have the privilege of making some comments upon the late Elbert D. Thomas, formerly a Member of this body, of whose death we have just learned.

Mr. President, the death of our former colleague, Elbert D. Thomas, fills us all with grief. Elbert Thomas was our most distinguished scholar-statesman. A long-time resident of and Mormon missionary to Japan, he knew the customs and literature of both Japan and China thoroughly. A skilled classical scholar, he had been an inspiring teacher of Latin and Greek, while at the same time he knew modern Europe at first hand, its languages, its literature, and its problems.

Taking his doctor of philosophy degree at the University of California, Elbert Thomas then taught political science at the University of Utah from 1924 to 1932, when he was elected to this body as a Democrat to succeed the late Reed Smoot. He served in the Senate for three full terms or for 18 years, and was particularly active on the three Committees of Foreign Relations, Military Affairs, and Labor and Public Welfare, serving as chairman of the two latter bodies.

During the war his broadcasts to Japan in the Japanese language were of great value in their frank statement of our good intentions, and they immeasurably weakened the Japanese will to resist. With Admiral Zacharias he was, however, insistent on retaining the Japanese Emperor so that Japan after the war would not degenerate into anarchy.

As chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, Senator Thomas worked for a strong Army to resist aggression and to protect national and collective security. His contributions to our preparedness and to our effective fighting strength in World War II were great, and

unfortunately not sufficiently appreciated.

But Elbert Thomas was basically a man of peace. He strove on the Foreign Relations Committee for a peaceful world. He was an informed supporter of the idea behind both the old League of Nations and the present United Nations. I had the honor of being a co-sponsor with him in 1950, prior to the aggression in Korea, of a resolution which would have pledged us to work for an agreement whereby the United Nations could more readily pool the forces of the world to resist aggression.

I came to know Elbert Thomas best from serving with him as a junior member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. We had some difficult bills to consider—notably the proposals to repeal or amend the Taft-Hartley law, the Federal aid-to-education bill, and the upward revision of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The discussions and disputes frequently became very heated; but never Elbert Thomas. He was always calm, always charitable and understanding in his attitude, and always humane in his point of view. It would be impossible for any man to be a more fair or a more considerate chairman.

But Elbert Thomas was probably most proud of his part in getting the beautiful Jefferson Memorial erected. He was its real sponsor, and despite bitter opposition from partisans who did not believe Jefferson should be so honored, or who quarreled with the type of architecture finally chosen, he succeeded in having the memorial erected. He obtained the necessary appropriations; he advised on the architecture of the memorial, which is partially modeled on that of Monticello; he selected the striking quotations from Jefferson which adorn its walls. He was, in short, its founder and father, and countless generations will benefit from his work. I can imagine the deep pleasure which he enjoyed when he saw Jefferson's magnificent statement on the freedom of the mind emblazoned for all to read and ponder:

I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

But most of all Elbert Thomas was a thoroughly good man. Scholar and statesman, he was humble and unassuming. He was a devoted husband and father. He trusted other people, and brought out the best in many. He encouraged youth, and loved to help them up the ladder. He was charitable to his opponents and kind to his friends. He possessed a massive patience along with his brilliant and well-trained mind. He was the best exemplar of his religion that I have met. His life preached. Unfortunately he did not escape contumely and was forced to tread the bitter wine press of pain. The attacks upon him in his last few years, I feel sure, almost broke his heart and ultimately contributed to his death. But he did not revile; rather he forgave his traducers. May his spirit and example help us all to be more charitable and more truly Christian. I feel about Elbert Thomas what Robert Browning wrote of the Monk Capon-

sacchi in his poem, *The Ring and the Book*:

Through such souls only, God stooping  
Throws sufficient of His light  
For us the dark to rise by.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by my distinguished colleagues, and to express my very deep regret and personal sadness at hearing the tragic news of the death of our former colleague, Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah.

I had the great pleasure and satisfaction of serving with Senator Thomas in the Senate for more than 2 years. I had the honor and privilege of serving under his chairmanship as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. During that service, in committee and on the floor of the Senate, I developed for Senator Thomas great admiration, deep affection, and the most profound respect and regard.

Elbert Thomas was a distinguished statesman, soldier, educator, philosopher, and leader in civic affairs. But, above all, he was a deeply religious and spiritual man.

I know of no man who so completely combined the qualities of great determination and force with deep humility and charity. He was in every way a gentleman. Truly a gentle man, he was charitable to his opponents and to his fellowman, for he was possessed of an understanding of the weaknesses of those less fortunate than he. At all times he was sincerely and unfailingly interested and devoted to the welfare of his country.

His untimely passing is a great loss to the people of the United States whom he served so long and so well as an educator, as a statesman, and in recent years in an important position in the Pacific. I join my colleagues in a very deep and sincere expression of regret and grief at his passing.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with respect to the tragic loss of Elbert Thomas I should like to say a few words. Few public officials are deserving of the title of statesman; but it may be truly said that Elbert Thomas was a great statesman. He recognized that a United States Senator should be a student of government, and he was such a student. He sought the facts and the truth and had the courage to follow the truth. Scholarly, kindly, understanding of human frailties, Elbert Thomas was a man of unimpeachable character. He loved people as people, and he sought to translate into legislation, programs and reforms which would give statesmanlike meaning to the principle that we are a government by law. He well realized the fact that as public officials Senators have the duty to promote the general welfare and to protect the dignity and spiritual values of the individual. American history will be richer in meaning and value because of the life of Elbert Thomas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] for himself and his colleague [Mr. BENNETT].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

## MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR BRIEN McMAHON, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address a very brief question to the distinguished acting majority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. The acting majority leader will recall that at the opening of the Congress on January 3 resolutions were offered in the Senate expressing regret at the passing of our beloved colleague, Brien McMahon, of Connecticut. At that time the majority leader agreed—as a matter of fact, I think it was at his own suggestion—that a time would be set aside when Senators who were the friends and colleagues of Brien McMahon could, on the floor of the Senate, give expression to their feeling of affection, regard, and admiration for him. Several weeks have passed. I ask if the acting majority leader will at this time entertain the request that a definite time be set aside—perhaps on Tuesday or Wednesday of next week—so that Members of the Senate may have due notice of the arrangement, at which time any of us who may wish to speak about our love and admiration for Brien McMahon may have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from New York, who discussed this subject with me earlier, that I told him that our program following the completion of business today will be to adjourn until Monday of next week. We plan to have sessions of the Senate on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of next week. We plan to set aside Wednesday as a day on which remarks concerning the late distinguished Senator from Connecticut may be made, in conformity with the resolutions referred to, and prior discussion with the majority leader.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the distinguished acting majority leader. I suggest that in view of the small attendance in the Senate today, any Senator who wishes on next Wednesday to eulogize not only Senator McMahon but also Senator Thomas, will at that time have the opportunity to do so. Thus the occasion would be one of tribute to both these great colleagues of ours. I, for one, would like to make some further remarks about our late colleague, Elbert Thomas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There is no question about that under our procedures.

For the information of the Senate, I will say that when the several speeches which remain to be made today are completed, it is the intention of the acting majority leader then to move to take up the Executive Calendar, copies of which are on the desks of Senators, I believe, or at least are available.

Previous to this time I have discussed with the minority leader of the Senate [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] the intention of the majority leader to take up the Executive Calendar. So far as I know, there is no objection to any of the nominations which appear on the Executive Calendar. At least, no objection has been brought to my attention.



## GEN. JAMES A. VAN FLEET

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in a few days the active military career of one of this Nation's greatest combat commanders—Gen. James A. Van Fleet—will draw to a close.

I am confident that every Member of the Senate, along with every mother and father in this Nation who has a son now serving in the bunkers of Korea or awaiting orders which may carry him there, felt a tug at the heart on hearing that this courageous but modest leader had laid down his heavy burden of command and is coming home.

Truly a "soldier's soldier," General Van Fleet is retiring in his 61st year, after 38 years of military service. For the past 22 months he has led his tough and able Eighth Army in the grim Korean strife. Despite the frustration of a stalemate in the harsh mountains and dreary valleys of Korea, which conformed with political decisions beyond his control, despite his heartsickness over the loss of his only son in air action over Korea, this stalwart infantryman forged from men of almost every race, creed, and color, one of the most formidable fighting machines in all history. President Eisenhower recently summed up in a few short words the stature of this sturdy soldier when he described Van Fleet as "the best qualified combat officer in the Armed Forces."

Yet, in Korea and back a few years earlier in Greece, General Van Fleet demonstrated that he is far more than a successful, aggressive, resourceful, dogged fighter. He possesses also those innate qualities of patience, understanding, and love of people that have enabled him to rebuild the shattered armies of South Korea into a gallant and intelligent fighting force which now mans the greater portion of that 160-mile battle line.

I am sure that the good people of South Korea will never forget this modest leader of the 8th Army. Many of us read a few days ago of his personal farewell to the people of that nation—how he stood with President Syngman Rhee bareheaded in a bitter cold wind on the steps of the battered capitol in Seoul and expressed in simple, heartfelt words before more than 25,000 South Koreans his deep appreciation for their loyalty and devotion and his abiding faith in their determination to carry on to victory. Choked with emotion he closed with the words "I will always be one of you."

In war-torn Greece a few years earlier General Van Fleet was chief of the American military mission which remolded a riddled Greek Army into a competent fighting force and stiffened the Greek nation to the point where it became a much-needed stabilizing influence in the troubled Balkans.

I am sure that if we are ever privileged to see the secret files of the Kremlin we will find the name of General Van Fleet near the top of the Kremlin list of those persons in the Western World who have done most to stem the onrush of communism. No greater tribute can be paid any American citizen.

In World War II General Van Fleet hit the Normandy beaches as a colonel commanding the spearhead 8th Infantry Regiment of the 4th Division. But it was only a matter of months until his proven combat leadership carried him through the roles of battle commander of the 4th Division, the 90th Division, and later the III Corps. He bears on his body the scars of three wounds, all received as an American infantryman.

Like many other Floridians, I have a particular personal interest and pride in this noble soldier, as he is a Floridian, reared in the little town of Bartow, Fla., which is my lifelong home. We were schoolboys together in grammar school and high school. We hunted, fished, and played baseball together. In those early days we other boys respected Jim Van Fleet for his kindness, his humility, his honesty, and his courage.

His appointment to West Point was from Florida. Following his graduation from West Point, he served at the University of Florida as professor of military science and tactics, and football coach. Those early years of service have endeared him to thousands of Florida students and their families.

I have read that General Van Fleet plans to retire to an orange grove he owns at Auburndale, a few miles from my home town. Whatever is his decision, I know that the people of Florida and of the Nation will hope and pray for many years of bountiful health and happiness for General and Mrs. Van Fleet.

But it is hard for me to believe that President Eisenhower, in his great wisdom, will let our country lose the services and talents of such an individual. Since World War II the United States has produced few men with such a pronounced grasp of military and diplomatic problems. He has been tested and has shown qualities of true greatness in both fields. This Nation will continue to need his firm hand and seasoned experience in the troubled areas of the world.

In connection with General Van Fleet's return from Korea and his approaching retirement from active duty, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks three editorials, entitled "Salute to a Soldier," from the February 2 issue of Life magazine, "Van Fleet's Farewell," from the February 11 issue of the Washington Post, and "Van Fleet Is Praised for a Job Well Done," from the February 11 issue of the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks an excerpt from the "Off My Chest" column of the Polk County Democrat of January 27, 1953, of Bartow, Fla.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Life magazine of February 2, 1953]

## SALUTE TO A SOLDIER

Gen. James A. Van Fleet has been ordered to give up his command of the Eighth Army in Korea, come home, and retire. He is turning 61, he is in his 38th year of military service, and he has had the field command in Korea for 22 months. He bows out with this tribute from President Eisenhower: "the

best-qualified combat officer in the Armed Forces."

General Van Fleet deserves the salutes of all Americans. He was one of the best of our infantry commanders in World War II. He rebuilt, trained, and to all effects commanded the Greek Army which in 1948 and 1949 defeated armed communism in Greece, and thereby gave the first proof that an application of serious and intelligent American effort could reverse the Soviet tide.

As commander of the U. N. forces in Korea, he has brought his forces safely through difficulties too little understood at home. During most of his time there, he has been required to wage a stalemate war. A soldier born and schooled to win, he has had little stomach for it. Neither have the men under his command. Given inferior or faltering leadership, our forces in Korea might literally have fallen apart. The fact that they constitute a fine fighting army today is in great part due to James A. Van Fleet.

Much has been told of late about the rebirth and growth of the ROK army. That, too, has been in large part Van Fleet's doing. In a complex chain of command no single man decides and does everything. But it may be said that there probably would be no ROK army in Korea today, holding two-thirds of the line, if at the start of his tour there in 1951 General Van Fleet had not made up his mind on two disputed points—we had to have the help of the South Koreans, and they were perfectly capable of giving it if they had sufficient training, equipment, and backing. Aside from the military rewards of this decision, the political effects in Asia have been immense. For the re-creation of the ROK army with United States help and supervision has demonstrated that Americans and Asians can work together, fight together, and even come to like and respect each other. In the unhappy days of 1950 and early 1951, when "gook" was the American synonym for all Koreans, almost no one thought it could ever happen. General Van Fleet made it happen, and for this alone he would be entitled to any honor in the gift of his country.

[From the Washington Post of February 11, 1953]

## VAN FLEET'S FAREWELL

The measure of the magnificent fighting spirit of Gen. James A. Van Fleet is contained in his farewell to the Eighth Army in Korea. "I find it very hard to leave you," he said on his departure for retirement, "and it hurts me to leave my work unfinished." That work is unfinished only because the nature of the limited war made a military victory as such impossible. The superb confidence shown by General Van Fleet has been at all times an inspiration to the United Nations force, and it is this sort of confidence, based on realistic assessment of strength, that denotes a competent commander. Every commander needs to believe that he can win.

Actually, the Korean war has always had more than the usual quantum of political overtones. In some ways they correspond to the political considerations that restricted General Van Fleet's campaigns during the rescue operation he conducted in Greece. Possibly a broad offensive of the kind General Van Fleet wanted would have made settlement easier. But the political aspects of war are a task for statesmen rather than for generals alone—especially in a coalition war—and the longer the Korean war has gone on the more important the political aspects have become.

Within the framework of his job General Van Fleet was a model man and a model leader of men. His belief in the offensive showed a willingness to take risks, a willingness that is all too rare among military men who traditionally always want more before they move. His task called for more than

military means, and these other means were not his responsibility. Men of good will everywhere will appreciate his great contribution to the defeat of aggression, and his inspiring leadership will live long in our military annals.

[From the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Fla., of February 11, 1953]

#### VAN FLEET IS PRAISED FOR A JOB WELL DONE

A change of command takes place in Korea today which involves a personality who is admired and respected throughout Florida, Gen. James A. Van Fleet, an adopted son of this State, turns over his responsibility as Eighth Army commander to Lt. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, and returns to the United States after nearly 2 years on the far-eastern battlefield.

A review of the retiring commander's record in Korea reveals his stature as a leader. By sheer dint of his forceful personality, Van Fleet exerted an influence on our fighting men which was responsible for the high morale maintained in that theater. The fact that he accomplished this feat under unfavorable circumstances adds much to his reputation as a field commander.

It was in mid-April of 1951 that Van Fleet was called to Korea to assume command of the Eighth Army. Gen. Douglas MacArthur had just been relieved as United Nations commander for differences of opinion with the administration over how the war should be fought, and Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway was given the job at Tokyo of directing the overall military effort.

Obviously that was not the kind of situation that made for a happy frame of mind among the troops. Already assailed by serious doubts as to the real purpose of the war, the fighting men were further perplexed by the discord among the Nation's top leaders.

Van Fleet's job was that of keeping our fighting team from becoming adversely affected by this situation. Then, as time went by, he had the added burden of boosting the morale of men who were asked to fight a war which carried no chance of victory.

Van Fleet's performance in Korea will stand for a long time as a miracle of combat leadership.

Floridians everywhere take great pride in the record of their adopted son, and they will continue to follow his career with keen interest; for although it has been indicated that the general may retire, the present world situation almost demands that a man of his capabilities be placed in a position where our Military Establishment can further profit from his experience as one of the outstanding field commanders of modern times.

[From the Polk County Democrat, Bartow, Fla., of January 27, 1953]

#### HERO COMING HOME

One of Polk County's favorite sons will be coming home soon.

With four stars on his shoulders, a chest full of medals on his tunic, and the gratitude of the people of three continents among his memories, Gen. James A. Van Fleet is scheduled for retirement a couple of months from now.

As one of this Nation's great leaders, General Jim has distinguished himself in three wars in little more than a decade—as a fighting man on the battlefields of World War II, as the virtual savior of Greece in its bloody fight against Communist guerrillas, and as commander of United Nations ground forces in Korea.

It must be hard for him to leave Korea to come home. He will be leaving behind his only son, a brave fighter like his father.

Jim, Jr., vanished in one of the bitter battles of last year. He is still listed as missing in action.

Not knowing whether his son is dead or alive in an enemy prison camp, is a galling emotion which the general shares with many another parent. It must be harder still on Mrs. Van Fleet, who hasn't the solace of being able to do something directly about the war, as her husband has been doing.

General Van Fleet has given fine service to his country far beyond the opportunities that fall to most men. He has richly earned the right to retirement and rest in civilian life. His neighbors in Bartow and Polk County will be eager to welcome him back.

But for the sake of the Nation which he has served and is serving so well, it is to be hoped that his former military commander, now occupying the White House, will claim General Jim's services still further in a high position at home.

#### DEATH OF RALPH HENRY CAMERON, FORMER SENATOR FROM ARIZONA

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is my sad duty to announce the death in his 90th year of Ralph Henry Cameron who served as a Member of this body from 1921 to 1927 as United States Senator from the State of Arizona. Mr. Cameron was born in Southport, Maine, in 1863, migrated to the Territory of Arizona when he was 20 years of age, making his home in Coconino County where he subsequently served as sheriff and as chairman of the board of supervisors. He engaged in stockraising and mining and later became nationally known as the builder of the Bright Angel Trail, which for the first time made it possible for tourists to visit the gorge of the Grand Canyon.

In 1908 Mr. Cameron was elected a Delegate from the Territory of Arizona to the 61st Congress and was reelected to the 62d Congress during which time he actively participated in the enactment of the legislation which enabled Arizona to be admitted into the Union in 1912. As a result of the election in 1920 he became a Senator from Arizona and served until March 4, 1927, when I became his successor. During his service here he was greatly interested in the development of the natural resources of Arizona and took particular pride in the passage through the Senate of the bill to authorize the construction of the San Carlos irrigation project, one of the principal features of which is the Coolidge Dam.

The passage of time has made it so that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is now the only Member who served with Mr. Cameron in this body. There are other Senators who became acquainted with him in subsequent years, and I am sure they will all join with me in extending our sincere condolences to his wife and daughter, who were at his side when he passed away yesterday in the city of Washington.

#### CLARIFICATION OF PRESS RELEASE OF A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I see the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] on the floor, and I am sure he will appreciate my making the statement I am about to make. As I told the Senator from Louisiana earlier this after-

noon, some of the members of the press seem to be a bit confused regarding a press release which our subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee issued for publication on Sunday. I refer to the Long-Stennis-Morse subcommittee which functioned at a time when the Senator from Louisiana and I were members of the Armed Services Committee.

Some of the members of the press have asked the junior Senator from Oregon why his name does not appear on the report, and they have misinterpreted a letter on the frontispiece of the report, signed by the Senator from Louisiana as not including the Senator from Oregon. It is simply a letter of transmittal by the Senator from Louisiana as chairman of the subcommittee to the chairman of the full committee, and it is not entitled to the interpretation they have made of it that it is only a Long report and that the junior Senator from Oregon is not a participant in the report.

So that there may be no misunderstanding among members of the press, and subject to verification by the Senator from Louisiana, let me say that the Senator from Louisiana and the junior Senator from Oregon stand shoulder to shoulder behind the report. We have no differences over its contents.

Some newspaperman made a reference to me in regard to one sentence in the report in which the report relates that members of the committee were not in complete agreement with reference to a matter which I am not going to discuss this afternoon. There is no disagreement between the committee members at all on the principle involved. I only want to wait before making final commitment on the matter until full negotiations have been completed in regard to the Spanish problem.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, what the Senator from Oregon has stated is correct. We joined in the statement. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] was at that time unable to make the trip of inspection with the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Louisiana, and, therefore, the Senator from Mississippi has every right to reserve his judgment. However, the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Louisiana went carefully over every word in the report, not only once, but several times, and agreed on every word in it.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana, because he has cleared up a misunderstanding on the part of some members of the press.

#### GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in January of last year, I was privileged to address the Senate for 2 days in opposition to the then pending measure, Senate bill 1976, which provided for the so-called home rule for the District of Columbia.

Some thought I was engaging in a one-man filibuster. Others, including a substantial number in this body, recognized that we were engaged in a serious



debate on a troublesome question involving an important point of constitutional law, namely: The power vested in the Congress to legislate for the District of Columbia, and our utter lack of power to delegate that function to any group or body within the District.

I shall trouble the Senate now for only a few minutes.

I urged the Senate, last year, to withhold its vote until a case then pending in the United States court of appeals—Thompson against District of Columbia—should be decided. I urged that such a forthcoming decision might chart a clearer course of action for us. At that time, I used this specific language:

Before closing my discussion of the law cases which I consider applicable to the constitutional barrier forbidding a delegation of our legislative power to another body—council or what not—if the proponents of this measure and the rest of us in this body are willing to exercise a little patience and forbearance, we may soon have another judicial expression on the subject which may better chart for us a course we may pursue in determining our rights as the supreme legislative authority for the District of Columbia. \* \* \*

Our power and the extent of a proper exercise of it is in issue, or, at least, it is an important issue, in a case now before the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, if not directly, certainly by every implication and as a matter of great public consideration. It is of particular concern to thinking lawyers who are Members of this body and the House of Representatives. What the court may say will be of importance to them. It may be of vast importance.

If the sponsors of this bill could restrain their eagerness for its immediate passage, further light for us may come out of the able United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. In many respects its jurisdiction is of wider range than our ordinary circuit courts of appeals. Its decision, no doubt, will case light and chart courses of thinking on a division of governmental powers, especially our own, in relation to what we may or may not do in the delegation of legislative authority. I will welcome a knowledge of the reasoning which that court may adopt.

Every lawyer who has tried cases has had experience with courts. Every lawyer who has argued cases on appeal knows that there are times when all the issues presented are not decided. There are times when a decision hides the real issues. There are times when the real issues are confused. The press indicates that there will be a decision en banc by the United States court of appeals, a court of able judges. A decision in which all of them participate will, if it discusses the limit of our power, go a long way toward dispelling doubt in our minds as to our power, and how much of our power we may properly delegate. I have no reason to doubt, because of the great public agitation locally for the past few years, the various so-called home-rule bills, the grave questions of law confronting us, and the flood of litigation which the court can reasonably and naturally anticipate pouring into its overflowing pond of litigated and pending cases, that it will meet and deal with this primary question head-on, with clarity, force, and reason. If it does—and I hope it will—the public business here will be aided to the extent the court may chart courses of appropriate action—not on policy—but on the power and the extent of our constitutional power as a legislative body under the precise language here involved. Some laymen are prone to mix policy with power. The courts rightfully steer clear of

framing a policy. They can light the candles for us so we can better judge for ourselves the extent to which, if you please, we must ourselves exercise and the extent to which we may delegate our power to another.

We may do well to await a decision of that court or of the Supreme Court of the United States on the question in this particular case. Much time could thus be saved. Many headaches and some heartaches for the future may be spared.

Mr. President, in the argument and discussion of last year, it was my duty to quote to the Senate an expression of judicial authorities bearing on the question, and sustaining the view that we might not properly delegate our legislative responsibility to a council or to an assembly in the District. Nevertheless, the Senate on January 22, 1952, by a vote of 41 to 35, refused to recommit Senate bill 1976. We spent over a week on the question which in my humble judgment could have been resolved in a few minutes if we had troubled ourselves to consider seriously the point of law involved. Weeks upon weeks were consumed by the District Committee of the House in a consideration of the Senate bill 1976, and this at an untold cost. Public interest here was greatly aroused. Excitement at times reached fever pitch. The press was seriously divided. Three of the local papers opposed the measure, while one favored it.

While there was some sniping at me, in the main I was credited with being entirely objective, wholly devoid of bias or prejudice. My argument was based solely on the law. The clamor of the crowd, the pleadings of the special groups around here, and the slanted interpretations of some legal opinions were unconvincing to me. Some of us hewed to the line of reasonable legal construction, and adopted the clear and convincing reasoning already employed by the courts whenever they had been called upon to express an opinion on the power of Congress to delegate a legislative function.

On January 22, 1953, just 1 year to the day after the Senate had declined to recommit Senate bill 1976, the United States court of appeals rendered its decision in the Thompson case. As I had hoped, this able court precisely reaffirmed the authorities cited in my 2-day address to the Senate, and clarified again our constitutional course of action. The specific ruling in the Thompson case was that—

Congress may not delegate a legislative function to any group, assembly, or council in the District of Columbia. \*

Whenever this question arises again, Mr. President, I recommend a careful study of this latest decision to the lawyers in this body, and particularly to the members of the Committee for the District of Columbia. That decision will furnish a very bright and guiding light to those who would follow lay reasoning that under the Constitution we can create in the District of Columbia a body to do for us what the Constitution says we alone must do.

There may be some, sufficiently interested, who will read my speech on the subject delivered on January 14 and 15, 1952. The authorities which I called to the attention of the Senate, and upon which my reasoning was based, were ex-

pounded and approved in this latest expression of judicial authority. The Senate had before it my quotations at length from the following cases: *Stoutenburgh v. Hennick* (129 U. S. 141), *Metropolitan Railroad Co. v. D. C.* (132 U. S. 1), *Roach v. Van Riwick* (MacArthur & Mackey's Reports 171), *Smith v. Olcott* (19 App. D. C. 61).

These cases focused their directives precisely upon the point involved, the inability of Congress to delegate a legislative function. It was argued here that the Stoutenburgh case was inapplicable because some question of interstate commerce also was involved indirectly in that case. The Court adopted the view here urged. The minority judgment of the Court casts the Stoutenburgh decision aside on the ground of its dicta, but in so doing entirely bypasses its former decision relating to interstate commerce—*Nield v. D. C.* (71 App. D. C. 306; 110 Fed. (2) 246).

If the Supreme Court of the United States should hear this case—and it probably will—I have little fear that it will reverse the clear reasoning of the court of appeals in the Thompson case. To do so, the Supreme Court would also have to reverse itself in two very late expressions on the power generally of Congress to delegate a legislative function. I have already called the Senate's attention to the case of *Panama Refining Co. v. Ryan* (293 U. S. 338) and the case commonly known as the sick-chicken case, *Schechter Poultry Corporation v. United States* (295 U. S. 495). There the Congress was forbidden to invest a Cabinet officer or the President with authority partaking of legislation.

As a lawyer, and because I took it upon myself to make an exhaustive study and exposition of all the forms of government established for the District of Columbia, I may be pardoned for bringing to the Senate's notice the fact that the views I entertained have met with this most recent judicial approval. The Senate will recall that I explained and explored in detail the fallacy of the argument based upon a sentence taken out of context from Madison's *The Federalist* No. 43. Much reliance could have been placed on such an authority were it not for the fact that no one theretofore, so far as I am advised, had ever troubled himself to expose the quicksand of such a tenuous contention.

Reverting to the Thompson case, we find the court of appeals, through Chief Judge Stephens, at page 20 of the advance copy of the decision, saying:

It is correctly suggested in *Roach v. Van Riwick*, that, for lack of a precise criterion, the determination of what powers are strictly municipal and may therefore rightly be conferred upon local corporations, and what powers are properly legislative and cannot therefore be delegated, is not always without difficulty. But we think that the constitutional provisions and principles and the rulings and reasoning above reviewed, which for this court are authoritative, clearly require the conclusion that the enactments of the legislative assembly of 1872 and 1873 which are under question in the instant case were of the character of general legislation, the power to enact which the Congress could not constitutionally, and did not, delegate to the legislative assembly.

Again, on page 23, the court said:

In view of the purpose and effect of the enactments as above described, we think that no other conclusion can reasonably be reached than that they were of the character of general legislation, the power to enact which the Congress could not constitutionally delegate to the assembly.

Even though the Congress may by preamble recite its authority for the passage of legislation, such assertion of power is not necessarily binding upon the courts. We cannot assume a power not conferred. We cannot by the same token delegate a power once it is conferred. This the court makes plain at page 26, saying:

But assuming that the Congress did regard the municipal enactments in question as within municipal power, that is not decisive of the question as to their validity. That question must be determined by the courts. We are referred to no judicial decision upholding as within the power of the municipal authorities of the District, the enactments referred to.

As one of the judges, Judge Prettyman, said, at page 38 of his concurring opinion, in referring to the way the minority opinion begged the question of the power to legislate by a body created by Congress for the District of Columbia:

We are not to determine what the law ought to be. That is for the Congress, not for the courts.

Avoiding the dilemma in which I find the case, the dissenting judges cast the 1872-73 enactments outside the area of either legislation or license condition, a little of each but wholly neither. But their position in that regard seems to me most insecure. They say, first, that the legislative assembly was a legislative body. But, of course, it could not be a true legislative body. Under the Constitution the Congress is, and can be, the only legislative body for the District of Columbia. The assembly was legislative in the sense that the word applies to the adoption of municipal ordinances, and in that sense alone.

The minority view of the court did not treat at all of the question whether the Congress might delegate a legislative function. It proceeded entirely upon the theory, and argued, that what was then in litigation was a municipal regulation rather than an act of legislation; otherwise, it could not properly have said at page 60 of the opinion:

To repeal a regulation is to make a regulation, and whoever can do the one can do the other.

Certainly such a view has no application to a supreme legislative body such as the Congress for the United States, or a State legislature for a sovereign State, both acting within their constitutions. Certainly Congress can pass a law of many sections, it can repeal some or all, and it often does recite that if part of an act is declared unconstitutional, the remainder shall nevertheless be effective.

The minority opinion also lacks precision in its choice of words, for, without even touching upon our power to delegate a legislative function, it loosely says on page 60:

The ordinance before us was enacted by a legislative body and has always been subject to legislative modification or repeal.

I have made these remarks today with no thought of self-praise and in no spirit of "I told you so." I said, last year:

Until we define home rule within our constitutional powers, marking on the one side that which is the exercise of legislative power vested solely within us, and on the other side, that which is purely a regulatory or ordinance power, and until we come to some definition that will meet the acid test of a fair judicial determination, these and all our other labors on behalf of this indeterminate thing classified in this bill as home rule will be idle and futile gestures. Our labors are looking in substance. They are, I take it, but as "a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal." The difficulty we face, as I see it, is: Can we give any responsible degree of self-government to the people in the District of Columbia without doing gross violence to the constitutional levy of exclusive legislative power upon the Congress? The answer to such a question, so far as I am concerned, is crystal clear; the right answer is not found in the pending measure, in this crazy quilt admixture of words of grants, restrictions, and reservations of power without the slightest apparent regard for the constitutional limitations placed upon us and for our own responsibility under the Constitution.

Quoting further from my speech, Mr. President:

Nowhere is there any responsible opinion of any lawyer or any court which has said to us, "Congress may delegate its legislative power in all cases to an agent—a council, if you please—or to any other body." The Congress cannot delegate a legislative function to the President, to a commission, or to any other agency of the Government. When Congress attempts to delegate a legislative authority upon another body, from that moment on it has departed from one of the cardinal principles of our constitutional form of government.

It was seriously contended by one of the cosponsors of S. 1976 that our power over the District was similar to our power over the Territories. Of course, it is not and never has been. The same contention was urged with some force before the court in the Thompson case. However, the court of appeals, quoting with approval a decision of a lower court on this subject, at page 13 of the opinion, said:

The court had been referred in the argument of the case to the laws establishing governments in the Territories as an example of the delegation of its legislative authority by the Congress which had received the sanction of judicial authority. But the court concluded that that was not a pertinent subject, saying:

"Non nostrum est tantas componere lites, but until it can be considered as settled, that the 'power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory, or other property belonging to the United States,' is identical with the power to exercise exclusive legislation over such district as may become the seat of government, the practice of Congress in regard to the territorial government furnishes us no authoritative guide in the interpretation of the clause relating to the District of Columbia." (MacArthur and Mackey's Reports at pp. 182-183.)

Considerable emotion was bestirred here locally when S. 1976 was under consideration. Columnists got into the act with a lot of irrelevancies. Even nationwide broadcasters took up the cudgels. Flames were sought to be fanned. Prejudices almost forbade dispassionate

discussion. Objective thinking was thwarted. Motives of some of us who opposed S. 1976 became and were impugned. The logic and reasoning of the court recently will, I trust, assuage some injured opinions. Upon reflection, the errors of some who seek to blame Congress for all our ills and every existing condition to which they in their moment of superior wisdom may not subscribe, can, if they will, be arightened. It was even said in this body that it was un-American to deny the people of the District the right to vote, to elect a legislative assembly, to pass their own laws, and so on, and so on.

These emotional outbursts appealed to some lay minds. They soothed the troubled minds of those who may have had an unfounded feeling of persecution merely because they themselves have chosen to live here. But to say that something is un-American which finds its basis in the very roots of our Government, from Madison's time through all the years and in all the decisions of our courts, is stretching the simple question of law a little beyond its breaking point. It carries an argument beyond the realm of reason into the fields of temporary passion.

We were called upon in the Senate last Friday to abdicate our true legislative functions in the matter of executive reorganization plans. I had some decided views on this subject. I entertained grave reservations regarding the propriety and wisdom of permitting executive legislation to supplant congressional legislation. I do not now feel, nor have I ever felt, that expediency in the passage of reforms should be the criterion for us when it results in the abrogation of our legislative responsibilities.

Mr. President, may I, in all seriousness, commend a careful reading, study, and reflection by the Members of this body upon the unanswerable reasoning of our United States Court of Appeals here, when we attempt by statute to delegate a power vested exclusively in us by the Constitution of the United States.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is my intention to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar, and then, immediately following that, resume legislative session in order that the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] may make some remarks which they want to make this afternoon.

#### REVOCATION OF ORDER TO THE SEVENTH FLEET

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the Record, as a part of my remarks, a press release of a statement issued by Gen. Douglas MacArthur on January 31, 1953, relative to the President's action in revoking the order to the Seventh Fleet requiring it to protect the Red Chinese mainland against combat operations by the free Chinese forces on Formosa.



There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

General MacArthur released the following statement on January 31, 1953:

"The reported decision of the administration to revoke the order to the Seventh Fleet requiring it to protect the Red Chinese mainland against combat operations by the free Chinese forces on Formosa will correct one of the strangest anomalies known to military history. This order issued in June 1950, proved to be a fundamental error which has contaminated the entire far-eastern situation.

"Its restriction upon the activity of the free Chinese forces gave public notice that the Chinese Reds were to enjoy unprecedented sanctuary in the struggle for Asia between the forces of communism and those of the free world. It was undoubtedly this decision with its implications which emboldened the Chinese Communist forces to intervene in increasing strength in Indochina, in Korea, in Tibet, and along the entire periphery of their aggressive advance in Asia.

"Actually it was this protection which permitted the transfer of the very Communist armies assigned to the coastal defense of central China for the attack upon our forces in Korea. Indeed, the concept of such sanctuary immunity unquestionably predominantly influenced Red China to enter the Korean conflict after the North Korean armies had been destroyed. For in the absence of assurance that his bases of attack and lines of supply to his rear would be safe, no military commander lacking both naval force and air cover would have committed large forces across the Yalu River.

"As a matter of historical record, when he did so, I immediately ordered the destruction by air bombardment of the bridges across the Yalu which would have imperiled his entire force. Within a matter of hours, my order was countermanded and these bridges, augmented and increased, have since borne millions of marching feet and hundreds of thousands of tons of supplies and munitions to sustain the enemy's operations against our hard-pressed forces. It has been stated that the purpose of the order to the Seventh Fleet was to prevent the spread of war, but the result has been just the opposite.

"It laid the basis for altering the localized character of the Korean conflict and set the stage for further involvements just as appeasement and indecisiveness have always done. The modification of the Seventh Fleet's orders should be supported by all loyal Americans irrespective of party. It certainly is time for this change."

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPPEL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPPEL in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James J. Wadsworth, of New York, to be deputy representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief remark about all the nominations before the Senate today. First, I wish to thank the committee for making available to Senators far in advance of the session today the information regarding these nominees which we needed in order to pass judgment on them.

Second, I wish to say that I am high in my commendation of James J. Wadsworth for appointment to the position for which he has been selected.

I also wish to express my compliments to H. Lee White, of New Jersey, who has been nominated to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force. He is an attorney in the city of New York, living in New Jersey. He and his wife, the record shows, have only \$1,200 worth of stock, and that stock is not in any of the corporations which can do business with the Air Force. Not only that, but in my opinion he has also followed another good policy; namely, severing his connection with his law firm for the duration of his service with the Air Force, and becoming only of counsel of the firm, and of course participating in payments from the firm only in respect to the capital account.

I was exceedingly pleased with Mr. White's qualifications, and also his sensitivity to what I consider to be the very important obligations of anyone holding a high position in our Government, and his making certain that under no possibility could he be even suspected of having an indirect interest in the position. In my opinion, he is highly qualified for the position to which he has been appointed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the absence of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to speak briefly on the nomination of Mr. James J. Wadsworth to be Deputy Representative of the United States to the United Nations. On behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee, I ask the Senate to confirm the nomination.

At the age of 47, Mr. Wadsworth is a man of exceptionally broad experience, including work in farming, in the New York State Legislature, in private business, and in the executive branch of the Federal Government. He has most recently been Acting Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, but prior to that he also had experience in the Economic Cooperation Administration and the National Security Resources Board.

I believe that Mr. Wadsworth's widely varied activities fully qualify him for the assignment as Ambassador Lodge's Deputy at the United Nations and that his broad experience will prove a valuable asset to our U. N. delegation.

His duties will be to work directly under Ambassador Lodge to implement the policies set forth by the President and the Secretary of State. He will represent Ambassador Lodge in the various committees and other bodies of the United Nations when Mr. Lodge himself cannot be present, and he will also conduct negotiations within the policy framework laid out by the administration.

The Foreign Relations Committee heard Mr. Wadsworth in executive session February 9 and voted without objection to report his nomination favorably.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I think Mr. Wadsworth's attitude toward the United Nations is a realistic one. He is devoted to its principles, and he believes in keeping his eye on the ball, to use a slang expression, and in putting first things first. He is optimistic about the future, but he does not expect any miracles.

I hope the Senate will confirm the nomination.

Mr. President, I am happy to add a word of appreciation of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] about Mr. Wadsworth. I know that had the Senator from Oregon been present at our meeting when Mr. Wadsworth appeared before the committee he would have been, as we all were, impressed with his grasp of the problems before the United Nations, and his eagerness to take over this important work as the deputy to Senator Lodge. I sincerely hope the nomination will be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of James J. Wadsworth to be Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary?

The nomination was confirmed.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Donald B. Lourie to be Under Secretary of State for Administration.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I desire, on behalf of the committee, to make a brief statement concerning the nomination of Mr. Donald B. Lourie.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the nomination of Donald Bradford Lourie, of Winnetka, Ill., to be Under Secretary of State for Administration, has approved the nomination without objection and recommends that it be confirmed by the Senate.

On February 6, 1953, the President sent the nomination of Mr. Lourie to the Senate for advice and consent to his appointment to be Under Secretary of State for Administration. The nomination was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations the same day; and on the ninth, the committee met in executive session to hear Mr. Lourie and to discuss with him his ideas about his new responsibilities.

Mr. Lourie will occupy the new position created by Senate bill 243—83d Congress, first session—namely, the position of Under Secretary of State for Administration. This bill, passed by both Houses of the Congress, was signed by the President on February 7, 1953. My colleagues will recall the discussion of that measure at the time the bill was referred to the committee.

At the time the committee reported Senate bill 243 to the Senate for favorable action, it called attention to the need for a man of outstanding ability to handle the difficult assignment of State Department reorganization. The committee noted the rapidity with which the State Department had grown and the many criticisms that have been directed against it for overexpansion of personnel and for overlapping offices and duties. In short, the committee believes the Department is in need of streamlining and that the Under Secretary of State for Administration will be required to spend much of his time on that task.

After hearing Mr. Lourie, the committee believes that he will be able to handle his difficult assignment. He brings to the State Department a wealth of broad administrative experience which should be helpful in improving the administration of our foreign relations. He comes without prejudice or past record to defend, and, therefore, should be able to take an objective and fair view of departmental operations and needs. He has a rich background of business and executive experience. Mr. Lourie started with the Quaker Oats Co. as a statistics clerk on July 13, 1922. Step by step he rose to the presidency, which office he attained on November 21, 1947. In the course of this rise he became the advertising manager, the sales manager, the vice president in charge of sales, and the executive vice president successively, prior to attaining the presidency. In addition, he holds a number of important business directorships, notably with the Mickelberry Food Products Cos., the Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., the United States Gypsum Co., the Illinois Central Railroad Co., and the Mathiesen & Hegdler Zinc Co., of Illinois. His business record is one of energy and initiative and industry.

Once again the committee wishes to call attention to the importance of the new office and the need for providing the best talent available to fill that important office. The committee is satisfied that President Eisenhower has found such talent in Mr. Lourie and recommends speedy action on the nomination by the Senate in order that Mr. Lourie may embark upon his task immediately.

If I may add a personal word, it so happens that when Mr. Lourie was an undergraduate at Princeton University I was executive secretary of that institution, under the last President Hibben. I have known Mr. Lourie since he entered college as a freshman, and I followed him through his brilliant career as an undergraduate student. He was one of the boys to whom I, as one of the administrative officers of the university, was very close. I have naturally watched his career with great interest

since he went to Chicago. First he was in the statistical department of the Quaker Oats Co., and from that low office worked his way steadily up, on sheer merit, until he became president of that great organization.

I can say without hesitation that in my estimation this is one of the finest appointments to an executive office the President has made; and I gladly add my word to that of the committee for which I am reporting, in the hope that his nomination will be promptly confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Donald B. Lourie to be Under Secretary of State for Administration?

The nomination was confirmed.

#### AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of H. Lee White to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey rises to commend the President of the United States upon the character and quality of the nomination of H. Lee White to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force. Although Mr. White was born in New York and is therefore a native son of that great State, we of New Jersey are very proud, indeed, to claim him as an adopted son of New Jersey.

I predict that New Jersey and the Nation will one day review the record of H. Lee White as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force with a deep sense of pardonable pride. I am confident that the record he will write in the high office to which he has been appointed will mark him as the great American I know him to be at this moment when he is entering upon the high and lofty position which he will soon take over.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I merely wish to add a word to the remarks of the Senator from Oregon and of my distinguished colleague [Mr. HENDRICKSON] with regard to Mr. White. I am glad to identify myself with the high recommendations which they have given to this distinguished gentleman. I do not know him well personally, but since his name came to us, and I was asked to check in my State with regard to his background and record, I took great pains to inquire in quarters where people would know the caliber of Mr. White. I am happy to report that from every source I heard only the highest kind of recommendation, both as to his character and his ability. So I am glad to add my word in commendation of this worthy citizen of New Jersey, and to urge the prompt confirmation of his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of H. Lee White to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force?

The nomination was confirmed.

#### PATENT OFFICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert Clement Watson to be Commissioner of Patents.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I commend the President of the United States for his selection of Mr. Watson to be Commissioner of Patents. He is a very capable lawyer and a very fine man. I wish him well as he embarks upon his new duties as Commissioner of Patents.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I should like to add my personal endorsement of Mr. Watson. He lived in my old congressional district for a number of years. I have had the opportunity to come in contact with him on several occasions. I know him to be a very competent and efficient lawyer, and I am confident he will serve in his new capacity with the same distinction with which he has served in many other capacities in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert Clement Watson to be Commissioner of Patents?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NINETY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADMISSION OF OREGON TO THE UNION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, tomorrow, February 14, 1953, is the 94th birthday of the State of Oregon. It was on February 14, 1859, that President Buchanan signed the bill admitting Oregon to the Union, a victorious ending to a long struggle. The Oregon Territory, the subject through decades of conflicting claims by Spain, France, Russia, England, and the United States, had become American in 1846. England, the last remaining contestant, then signed a treaty recognizing the 49th parallel of north latitude as the dividing line between Canada and the United States, west of the Rocky Mountains, giving up its former insistence on the Columbia River as the boundary. This clarification of America's title to the territory gave a new impetus to the agitation for official territorial status, an agitation



that had gone on, pressed by a few persistent people, in Congress and out, since 1820. In that year Representative Dr. John Floyd, of Virginia, had attempted to have a committee appointed to look into the matter of occupying the Columbia River, and in 1822 he had again urged Congress to take action in the matter of Oregon Territory—the first bill applying the name Oregon to the land.

From 1827 through 1831, the subject was kept before Congress, and thus indirectly before the people, through the efforts of Hall J. Kelley, a Boston school-teacher, who, through Representative Floyd, Senator Everett, of Massachusetts, and Senator Benton, of Missouri, had several petitions presented to Congress asking recognition of the Oregon Territory. It is a pleasure to pause here and do honor to the name of Mr. Kelley, a man to whose energy and public spirit Oregon and the other States formed from the Oregon Territory owe much. I recognize him as typical of the great number of citizens who realize that government is the business of everyone, and who, whatever their position in life, think out the problems of government and make their thinking known to those in official position to act. I like particularly, in this connection, to reflect on the fact that Mr. Kelley, not content with writing to his own Representative and Senators, sought out like-minded men in Congress, representing Virginia and Missouri, who were of a mental scope to match the continentwide expansion of the United States.

By 1843, while the Territory was still under the joint occupancy of England and the United States, it had set up its own provisional government. On August 14, 1848, President Polk signed the bill which he had been urging since 1846, to grant Territorial status to the Oregon country, and on March 3, 1849, the last day of Polk's administration, the Governor he had appointed, Joseph Lane, took office, having the good fortune to find the Territory already provided with a government in full working order. This is the only time in the history of the Nation that it has been possible for a newly appointed territorial governor, in a newly established territory, to take over a complete and smoothly functioning local government and make it the Territorial government.

Though the history of the Oregon Territory is full of international conflict and threats of war, the Territory is the one region of the United States that we acquired purely through diplomacy and settlement, and not by purchase or war.

Credit for the peaceful state of the Oregon country through the period of joint colonization and occupancy by England and the United States must be given principally to the justice and magnanimity of Dr. John McLoughlin, who was, from 1824 to 1845, head of the Columbia district of the Hudson's Bay Company, a region comprising all the northwest land beyond the Rocky Mountains and northward to the land claimed by Russia. While, with few exceptions, Members of Congress and other citizens of the United States maintained a bland indifference to the entire region, Dr. McLoughlin, as supreme local representative of the Hudson's Bay Company, and

virtual representative of the English Government, could wield undisputed power. This power he used with admirable restraint, faithfully and honestly serving the interests of his company and his government, and working wholeheartedly for peace and justice. A Catholic in his childhood, Dr. McLoughlin seems to have been at least nominally a member of the Church of England through his adult life, until 1842, when he returned to the Catholic Church, being received by his friend, Father Blanchet. Through his years of power, whether as Anglican or as Catholic, Dr. McLoughlin was noted for the hospitable welcome and practical help which he gave to missionaries, Protestant and Catholic, whether English, French, or American. Even the agricultural settlers, who came in 1843 and after, and whose activities Dr. McLoughlin well knew would mean the end of the vast wilderness the Hudson's Bay Company must maintain for its fur business—even these farmers, the bane of the frontiersman and fur trapper, he welcomed as friends, gave them what help they needed, and lent them money and supplies. He could not have prevented their coming, and the eventual loss of the land by both England and the Hudson's Bay Company, to the settlers from the United States; but a man of smaller mind would not have perceived the inevitable development of the area, and a man smaller of soul would have made the difficulties of the early settlers, already great, almost insurmountable. Dr. McLoughlin stands for what we like to remember about the history of Oregon—the development from a truly paternal rule to a rule by the people; the peaceful transition from British and joint occupation to American territorial status; the protection of the interests of Indian and settler alike; and the impartial support of the civilizing influence of religion, without distinction as to creeds.

Among the missionaries welcomed and aided by Dr. John McLoughlin was Jason Lee, a New England Methodist, who first went to Oregon in 1834, with four companions. Following Dr. McLoughlin's advice, they located a mission on the east bank of the Willamette, 10 miles north of the present city of Salem. In 1838 Lee returned to the East, and stirred up interest in the Oregon country by conferences in New York with the board of managers of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Church. Senator Linn, of Missouri, presented to the Senate on January 28, 1839, a petition signed by Lee and his companions and 31 other American residents of Oregon, calling upon the United States to take formal and speedy possession of the region. Lee made a speaking tour through the New England States, New York State, and the region around Philadelphia and Washington, in which he brought the importance of Oregon to the attention of thousands. A tangible result of this strenuous effort was the addition of a further party of missionaries, numbering 51 persons, who joined Lee and his companions in a new mission, 10 miles to the south of the old one, where they built a sawmill, a gristmill, houses, and the Indian school that later developed into Willamette Univer-

sity, one of the leading educational institutions, not only of my State, but of the West.

On February 14, the birthday of the State of Oregon will be fittingly celebrated by the presentation to the United States, to stand in honor in the United States Capitol, of statues of these two pioneer heroes of Oregon. I hope all my hearers will take the occasion to read the excellent summary of the early history of the Territory and State, prepared by Dr. Burt Brown Barker, chairman of the Oregon Statuary Committee, entitled "Oregon, Prize of Discovery, Exploration, Settlement," with its splendid summary of the achievements of these two great men. I have, of course, drawn upon this valuable booklet in the preparation of this talk, but there is much of interest that I have not had time to include.

Mr. President, I should like to take a brief moment to pay my sincere tribute to this great citizen of my State, Dr. Burt Brown Barker, the author of this historic narrative. He is noted for the outstanding service he has rendered as vice president of the University of Oregon. He is also a distinguished lawyer, a real humanitarian, and a keen student of Oregon history. I suppose that no man in America knows as much about the history of the Hudson's Bay Company and Dr. McLoughlin's relation to the activity of that company in helping to develop the great Pacific Northwest as does Dr. Burt Brown Barker.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of my remarks there be printed in the RECORD a copy of the letter which I sent to all Senators, dated February 13, and the text of the historic narrative entitled "Oregon, Prize of Discovery, Exploration, and Settlement," written by Dr. Burt Brown Barker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. The thought of the early Oregon Territory, and the admission of the State of Oregon to the Union, inevitably makes me think of the comparable situation of our present farthest northwest Territory—Alaska. In the census of 1860, the first after Oregon's statehood was granted, there were 52,465 people, sparsely settled through that land of forests, mountains, and rushing rivers. Oregon had been self-governing for about 15 years, and a Territory for about 10, when it was admitted. Alaska, with its forests, mountains, and rushing rivers, has by the 1950 census 128,643 inhabitants, and it has been a self-governing Territory for 40 years. Let us take to heart the appeal of Alaska's officially chosen flower—forget-me-not.

In closing my comments relative to the birthday anniversary tomorrow of the State of Oregon, and the historic event which will take place in Statuary Hall in the Capitol tomorrow, when leaders of my State dedicate the statues of these two great pioneers and frontiersmen, I wish to pay my thanks to the Vice President of the United States, who has assured me that he will be present at the dedication ceremonies and will accept, in behalf of the Federal Government,

these great works of art as symbols of two great pioneers of the West.

#### EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
February 13, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the State of Oregon, I am pleased to present the attached historical narrative, Oregon, the Unique Prize, by Dr. Burt Brown Barker, of Portland, Ore. The 14th of February marks the 94th anniversary of Oregon's statehood. Therefore, I am sure that you will find this narrative to be of special significance.

On Saturday morning, February 14, 1953, the State of Oregon will present to the United States the impressive statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and the Reverend Jason Lee. These men were outstanding leaders in the early history of Oregon. It is with sincere pride that the State of Oregon places these replicas of its great men beside those of illustrious leaders of her sister States.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

#### OREGON, PRIZE OF DISCOVERY, EXPLORATION, AND SETTLEMENT

(By Burt Brown Barker)

##### I. DELAYED DISCOVERY OF COLUMBIA RIVER

The first in this series of distinctive events in the history of Oregon which sets it apart from the other States in the Union is the tardy way it was discovered.

It seems incredible that almost 300 years should elapse, after Balboa first saw the Pacific Ocean (1513), before the Columbia River was entered by Capt. Robert Gray (1792), a Boston navigator.

Commonly accepted authorities set 1492 as the date Columbus discovered America; 1607 as the date of the founding of Jamestown, Va.; and 1620 as the date the Pilgrims settled Plymouth, Mass.

It will be noted that between 1492 and 1607 there is a gap of more than 100 years which is devoid of recorded events of strategic importance on the Atlantic coast of the United States. It was different on the Pacific coast.

During that 100 years the explorers turned south toward milder climates and more lucrative fields. In 1513 Balboa discovered the Pacific Ocean. In 1521 Cortez in Mexico, and in 1532 Pizarro in Peru, were seizing and carrying to Spain great wealth in gold, silver, and precious stones. In 1542 Cabrillo entered the present San Francisco Bay. In 1578 Sir Francis Drake touched the southern coast of Oregon, landed and gave it the name New Albion (New England). It was on this trip that he surprised and looted one Spanish port after another, ran down ship after ship and stripped them of their treasures.

In 1580 Drake returned to England with 26 tons of silver, 80 pounds of pure gold, 13 chests of gold plate, and quantities of emeralds, pearls, and other precious stones. His vessel was only 100 tons burden, so he threw overboard much of the silks and other fabrics which it could not carry. When he landed in England, Queen Elizabeth dined with him on board his vessel, the *Golden Hind*, and conferred knighthood on him, while London took a Roman holiday.

Thus during the 100-year period of inactivity on the North Atlantic coast following 1492, the South Atlantic and the Pacific coasts were alive with Spanish and English adventurers. However, after the discoveries of Cabrillo in 1542 on the Pacific Coast, the Spanish became interested in the trade of the Indies and their ships followed the tradewinds from the coast of California to the westward, leaving the coast of Oregon and lands to the north untouched.

The English also gave up activity in the Pacific after the exploits of Drake in 1580. They became interested in the riches of India, and sent their vessels to the east around

the Cape of Good Hope, without making any effort to follow up the exploits of Drake. This condition existed for almost 200 years.

At the close of the Seven Years' War in 1763, England again turned attention to the Pacific. The government offered a prize of 20,000 pounds for the discovery of the long-sought Northwest Passage. Capt. James Cook, in his first try in 1773, headed an expedition which discovered the Hawaiian Islands. On his last trip, on July 12, 1776, he set sail via the Cape of Good Hope for the land Drake in 1578 had designated as New Albion, a name the British had consistently kept alive.

In March 1778 Cook reached the Oregon coast, reportedly about 43° north latitude. Heading north, keeping in sight of land almost continuously, he noted the coast line with more care than others had done previously. He observed and named Capes Perpetua and Foulweather in Oregon, and Cape Flattery in Washington, which names are still preserved. Continuing, he landed at Nootka Bay on Vancouver Island, missing both the mouth of the Columbia River and the entrance to the Strait of Juan de Fuca, which later he sought specifically.

After spending a month trading with the Indians at Nootka Bay, he continued north through Bering Strait into the Arctic Ocean, until he was blocked by ice. This voyage for the moment put an end to the myth of the Northwest Passage. It was epochal so far as Oregon was concerned, for it established the fact that there was no water shortcut to the Pacific Northwest; the only water approach was around either Cape Horn or Cape of Good Hope, both being long and hazardous. It was an element in the isolation of Oregon.

Just as England had returned to explorations on the Pacific coast, so also had Spain. Spain came to realize that she had not followed up the exploits of Cabrillo (1542), so engaged had she been in her trade with the Indies, and in the riches of Mexico and Peru. Fearing lest she would forfeit what Cabrillo had won, she put forth a feeble and ineffectual effort under Viscano and Aguilar in 1602, but soon fell again into inaction. As the Russians began to press down from the north, and the English were again on the prowl, she realized that either a serious effort must be put forth, or she must retire from the conflict.

She began by fortifying Monterey and San Diego in 1768, and within a few years the Franciscan fathers under Junipero Serra had established their mission in the southern part of California. She then began anew her northern explorations, after more than a century and a half of inactivity. In 1774 Juan Perez went as far north as 54° north latitude.

The next year Brun Heceta and Bodega y Quadra were dispatched to the north. Heceta went beyond 50 degrees, and then turned back. He doubtless saw the mouth of the undiscovered Columbia River, and made an ineffectual effort to enter it on August 17, 1775. He noted and named the two capes at the mouth of the river. On July 18, he saw and accurately described Mount Neah-kahnie which he named Table. He also located and named capes Falcon and Lookout.

Bodega y Quadra continued his journey to the north and explored part of the coast of Alaska. Spain had long worked on the theory that she had the right to all the western shores of both North and South America washed by the waters of the South Sea (Pacific Ocean) which had been seen first by Balboa (1513). This theory was based on the decree of the Pope, Alexander VI, who, after the return of Columbus, divided the world in two parts, by drawing a line from north to south through the Atlantic Ocean 100 leagues west of the Azores and Cape Verde Islands. To Spain he gave "all the future lands and islands found, or to be found, discovered or to be discovered toward the west and south."

England, per contra, took the position that Spain could claim only such land as she occupied. Merely to skirt the coast, touching it here and there, and giving names to a few capes, rivers, and promontories, was insufficient. To establish a legal claim she must actually settle and continue to inhabit the parts claimed. England disregarded completely any title or claim arising out of any decree coming from the Pope in Rome.

A further stimulus to these Spanish upsurges in explorations, was the activities of Russia in Alaska, and along the coast to the south. These began when Peter the Great of Russia gave the Dane, Vitus Bering, a commission in 1724 to explore and chart the coast of Alaska and south. He discovered the strait which bears his name. His last voyage was in 1741. It was on his discoveries that Russia based her claims to Alaska.

The furs which his men carried back with them, began the fur trade which later became the magnet which drew the English, Spanish, and finally the Americans to the north Pacific coast, and in the end led to the discovery of the Columbia River and the exploration and early settlement of Oregon.

The East India Co. made the next British attempt to enter the picture. The fur trade, which the Russians were now carrying on with China, was the cause of their entry. They were slow to begin because their business in the East Indies was so profitable. They had been given the trading right to the western coast of America, and thus no other English company could operate there.

By 1785 the company began to operate out of ports in India. In this way Captain John Meares, an interesting and spectacular character, sailed from Bengal in 1786. He probably was the first explorer actually to enter the Strait of Juan de Fuca, in 1788. He did not explore the strait fully. Rather he returned to the mouth, and then sailed south. He located Cape Disappointment, at the mouth of the Columbia, which he identified as the cape found by Meceta in 1775. He examined the location carefully, and satisfied himself that there was no river at that point, as indicated on the Spanish charts which he had. Thus Meares, as well as Heceta, had missed the Columbia, as if the river were in hiding.

But the Russians pushing down from the north, and the English operating out of the east through the East India Company, had struck the real Bonanza—the rich fur trade of the north. While rival explorers were locating new islands, bays, inlets, and gaining much information about the north, the English and the Russians were concentrating on the fur trade. The news spread rapidly, and soon traders were in full cry.

Nootka Sound, on the northern coast of Vancouver Island, was the magnet and became the local headquarters. This stimulated the Spanish until they entered every open bay and harbor along what is now British Columbia and southern Alaska. By this time a new government had been set up on the Atlantic sea coast, and a new flag, the Stars and Stripes, began to appear among the flags of Russia, England, Spain, Portugal, and for a short time, France. But for the moment Nootka and the north were in the limelight, and the coast of Oregon was accordingly bypassed.

Spain was now thoroughly aroused. With Russia in Unalaska, she realized that she must protect Nootka against all comers. She sent a flotilla of four vessels to fortify it. England and Russia each had colonization plans for Nootka. Into the thick of the melee Captain Robert Gray in the packet *Washington* and Captain John Hendrick in the ship *Columbia* sailed and cast anchor at Nootka Bay in 1790. No other vessels were there at the time and all seemed serene.

But the Spanish flotilla under Martinez soon arrived. In view of the fact that the American vessels had passports given by General Washington to permit a voyage of discovery round the world, they were not



arrested. The captains, however, were cautioned that it was prohibited by ordinance for any foreign nations "to sail the coast of America."

Soon thereafter the British sailed into Nootka and began to fortify it. Martinez seized their vessels and the stage was set for a war between Britain and Spain. But the war never materialized. Spain backed down and the matter was settled by arbitration. Meanwhile the rich fur trade had grown brisk and competition keen.

On his return to England in 1790, after failing to discover the Columbia, Meares published a pamphlet in which he indicated that he still felt that there was the long-sought Northwest Passage, connecting the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. It was a tradition hard to kill. Accordingly, England determined once more to explore that possibility fully and settle it finally.

Capt. George Vancouver was given the commission. He was to examine and survey minutely the Pacific Coast, from latitude 30° to 60°; and, specifically, he was instructed to inquire into "the nature and extent of any water communication which may tend in any considerable degree to facilitate an intercourse for the purpose of commerce between the northwest coast and the country on the opposite side of the continent." That certainly was a commission broad enough to cover any rivers of extent flowing into the Pacific from about Mexico on the south, to Alaska on the north. Quadra, Heceta and Meares had stopped and examined the breakers at the mouth of the Columbia River; and maps since 1601 had indicated the presence of a river at or near the present site of the Columbia. But its existence had never positively been determined. Vancouver now had his chance.

In January, 1791, he sailed away in command of the sloop-of-war *Discovery* of 400 tons burden, and a much lighter armed tender *Chatham* in command of Lieutenant Broughton. He had ample equipment and personnel for a scientific voyage of discovery. He spent the winter in the Hawaiian Islands, and on April 17, 1792, arrived off the coast of California, at latitude 39°. Heading northward he reached Cape Orford, Oreg., April 24.

On the evening of April 26, under clear skies and with conditions peculiarly satisfactory for observation, he was at the point which Captain Meares had described so accurately. He was especially interested in Meares' description; and also he wanted to prove or disprove the assertion of Heceta that there was a river at this point. All day of the 27th he sailed along the coast, describing the landmarks so accurately that his position is easily identified. He appeared to be following Meares' description. After noon he identified Cape Disappointment and Deception Bay. He was now at the mouth of the Columbia. At this point his log read:

"The sea has now changed from its natural to river-colored water; the probable consequence of some streams falling into the bay, or into the ocean to the north of it, through the low land. Not considering this opening worthy of more attention, I continued our pursuit to the northwest being desirous to embrace the advantage of the breeze and pleasant weather so favorable to our examination of the coast."

Thus Vancouver, with charts and the Meares' log and the evidence of Heceta at hand, and with the discolored river water under his vessel giving full evidence of the presence of the river which he specifically sought, considered it not "worthy of more attention," and passed up another opportunity of history.

Now, a new group of merchant traders, also interested in breaking into the highly profitable fur trade, must be introduced. A small group of six Boston merchants in 1787 organized a company, for the purpose of entering the field as traders in the Northwest Pacific. They purchased two small vessels: a full-rigged ship called *Columbia*, of

212 tons, and a sloop of 90 tons called *Lady Washington*. The first was under command of Capt. John Hendricks, and the second under command of Capt. Robert Gray. They sailed out of Boston on October 1, 1787, and headed around Cape Horn for Nootka Sound. As Captain Gray sailed north along the Oregon coast, he noted what he thought to be mouths of rivers, but was never close enough to be certain. He and Hendricks gathered a cargo of furs. These were taken to China and traded for a cargo of tea and silk, which was taken to Boston.

In September of 1790 a second voyage was organized, and in June 1791 Gray was quartered at Clayquot Sound near Nootka, where an unhappy winter was spent. In the spring of 1792 Captain Gray, in the *Columbia*, sailed south along the coast of Oregon and California. The weather was unpropitious and he turned north again. It probably was on his return trip that he met Vancouver, on April 30, near the Strait of Juan de Fuca, and discussed with him his experience in searching for the Columbia River, and doubtless was told by Vancouver that the river did not exist.

Gray had seen what he thought to be mouths of rivers, as he had passed up and down the coast, and determined to return, hoping in such openings to find furs in the hands of Indians where traders had not been. On May 7, 1792, he entered one such harbor which now bears his name. Proceeding down the coast, trading as he went, on May 11 he found himself in a great body of river water completely covered with whitecaps. Being venturesome, he steered in and recklessly did what careful mariners seldom do, namely, thrust the prow of his vessel into white breakers. But fortune was with him and he crossed the bar successfully and found himself in the mouth of the river which had appeared on maps from 1601, and had been observed by Quadra, Meares, and Vancouver surely, and probably by others.

Captain Gray remained and traded with the Indians in the lower reaches of the river near its mouth until May 20 when he recrossed the bar and sailed north where later he met and told the astonished Vancouver of his discovery. Unwilling to believe Gray's story, Vancouver the following October returned to the mouth of the river. He was never able to cross the bar in the *Discovery*, but Lieutenant Broughton in the *Chatham* was successful in doing so.

Thus the Columbia River was discovered and named by Capt. Robert Gray, after he crossed the bar at the mouth on May 11, 1792, 300 years after the discovery of America by Columbus. This discovery became a very vital issue in the subsequent contention that Oregon was property of the United States by virtue of discovery, and that, too, after the coast south of parallel 42 and north of parallel 49 had been known for more than 100 years.

## II. ORIGIN OF THE NAME OREGON

The discoveries of Columbus and Vesputius caught the imagination of Europe and writers began to dream of romantic new far-away lands.

Comparatively soon after the publication of the voyages of Vesputius, Sir Thomas More published his *Utopia* in 1516, and in it placed the scene of his dreamland in a region far beyond the farthest reach of any land seen by Vesputius. He imaged a new world with higher and broader political aspirations.

After a lapse of more than 100 years, Sir Francis Bacon published his *New Atlantis* in 1629. By this time Balboa had discovered the Pacific Ocean, the Spaniards had ravaged Mexico and Peru and visited a part of the western shore of America. Sir Francis Drake in turn had ravaged the Spaniards and in 1578, landed, claimed the country in the name of the English king, and named it New Albion (New England). Thus the name was applied to the Pacific coast many

years before the first permanent settlement on the Atlantic coast. The *Boston Sentinel* (September 1787) notes the clearing of the ship *Columbia*, bound for New Albion.

Bacon chose to locate his New Atlantis in the region Drake called New Albion, a region students contend easily fits the description of the coast of southern Oregon.

During the 16th and 17th centuries of fables and myths, such names as Terra Incognita and New Albion were attributed to lands now recognized as parts of Oregon. Returning adventurers of these two centuries caused many writers to weave fanciful stories of legendary cities, such as Axa and Quivira, and place them in the newly discovered western coast of America.

In 1601 a map appeared on which the fabled city and kingdom of Quivira was placed in approximately the same location as that indicated as New Albion by Sir Francis Drake.

But no name, similar in sound or spelling to the name Oregon, has been found on any map, or in any book, until it was used by Maj. Robert Rogers in 1765, when, in a document to King George III he proposed to seek out the Northwest Passage. In this document he described his route as being "from the Great Lakes toward the head of the Mississippi, and from thence to a river called by the Indians Ouragon."

Major Rogers did not himself attempt such a journey, but the following year he outlined a similar expedition with Jonathan Carver as the draftsman of the party. This expedition also never materialized.

Subsequently both Rogers and Carver returned to England. In the interval before his return, Rogers appears to have learned more local geographical details. In 1772 he addressed another petition to the King. In this one he outlined the proposed journey, saying in part: "About the 44° of latitude to cross—into a branch of the Missouri and stem that northwesterly to the source, to cross then a portage, into the great river Ourigan." Thus he outlined a course which, in general, was subsequently followed by Lewis and Clark. Likewise he introduced for the first time the word Ouragon or Ourigan, which, with a slight change of spelling was to become Oregon.

But the change was not to come at the hands of Rogers, but by the work of his associate, Carver, who had returned to England with him.

In 1778 Carver published his book of Travels. It is in this book that the present spelling is found. In the text, for the first time so far as is now known, he used the expression "River Oregon or River of the West." He claimed to have learned the word from the Indians, with whom he lived on the upper reaches of the Mississippi River in 1766-67. But no student has been able to find any Indian word of a similar sound for the basis of such a spelling.

This book of travels was so popular that it was reissued in other editions and forms in Paris, Edinburgh, Dublin, Philadelphia, New York, and elsewhere. Although Carver wrote of the river, he never saw it, and it remained for Capt. Robert Gray, an American, to enter it in 1792, 300 years after the discovery of America. He gave it the name of his vessel, *Columbia*, entirely oblivious, so far as known, of the name Oregon given it by Captain Carver.

Thus the name Oregon was used first for a river. It was definitely changed to designate the land, in a bill brought into Congress by Representative John Floyd, of Virginia, on January 18, 1822. In this bill he proposed the creation of Oregon Territory.

The young poet William Cullen Bryant apparently was impressed with Carver's book, and in 1817 he gave added popularity to the name when he wrote in his poem, *Thanatopsis*:

"Where rolls the Oregon and hears no sound  
Save his own dashings, yet the dead are there."

Many scholars have speculated on origins of the name, but to date no satisfactory explanation has been found.

Thus a new land, which had had a mythical existence for two centuries, was finally materialized and given a new name of liquid sound and romantic significance, Oregon.

### III. HOW THE OREGON COUNTRY BECAME A PART OF THE UNITED STATES

The purpose of this chapter shall be to show how the district west of the Rocky Mountains and north of 42°, became a part of the United States. This district is known historically as the Oregon country. It enjoys the rare distinction of being the only part of the United States which was neither purchased nor fought for in war. It came rather as a result of what is broadly called colonization.

#### (a) Government action

As a result of the Revolutionary War, the Mississippi River became the western boundary of the United States by the Treaty of Paris (1783).

Following the discovery of the Columbia River (1792), the Louisiana Purchase (1803) pushed the western boundary from the Mississippi River to the summit of the Rocky Mountains.

When President Jefferson organized the well-known Lewis and Clark Expedition (1804-06) and sent it overland across the Rocky Mountains, it became evident that the western boundary of the United States must again move west even to the Pacific Ocean.

How this came to pass is the next part of this story.

John Jacob Astor, with his Pacific Fur Co., followed the Lewis and Clark expedition and established a fur-trading post at Astoria in 1811. It was the first successful American settlement on the newly discovered Columbia. Following close on the heels of this new settlement came the North West Co. men, also seeking to be the first to explore and settle the new territory. The race between the North West men and the Astor men was a close one; the Astorians winning by 2 months. The party of Astorians who won, was waterborne, around Cape Horn, while the North West men came overland to the headwaters of the Columbia, and then down the river to its mouth. Imagine their surprise and disappointment on their arrival there to find the Americans erecting a trading post.

The American victory was short-lived. As a result of the War of 1812, Astor's partners at Astoria, fearing they would be victims of the English warship en route to capture them, sold out the company to their rivals, the North West Co. in 1813. Thus, the first American settlement in the new Oregon country came to an end.

Napoleon, hard pressed by England, sold the United States Louisiana without defined northern bounds. It became necessary to determine the northern boundary of the Louisiana Purchase. England was anxious to know how far to the north this purchase was supposed to extend. Each country appointed commissioners, and in 1818 they fixed the boundary between the United States and present Canada on the 49th parallel of north latitude, from Lake of the Woods west to the crest of the Stony (Rocky) Mountains. They could not agree on the line beyond that point. The American commissioners insisted on following that same parallel west to the Strait of Georgia. The English insisted on following that parallel to the upper reaches of the Columbia, thence down that river to the Pacific Ocean.

Being unable to resolve this difference, the parties decided to leave the land west of the Rocky Mountains open to joint occupation for a period of 10 years.

Following the convention of 1818, the young American Government took its first step to protect its interest in this new territory by entering into a treaty with Spain in

1819, by the terms of which Spain relinquished all rights to the territory north of 42° north latitude. In 1820 Representative Dr. John Floyd, of Virginia, had a committee report out a bill favoring the appointment of a committee to look into the matter of occupying the Columbia River. Nothing came of it. In 1822 he again urged Congress to take action touching on Oregon Territory. This is the bill in which the name Oregon was first applied to the land. In 1824 he presented, and had passed in the House, a bill to provide a territorial government for Oregon. It was tabled in the Senate. Meanwhile the State Department had been successful in writing a treaty with Russia, by which she surrendered all territorial claims south of 54°40'. Thus, by the treaties of 1819 and 1824, both Spain and Russia bowed out of the Oregon country, leaving contend for it.

The Territory involved was 880 miles long, 550 miles wide and contained 450,000 square miles. It was more than six times the size of New England, and 30,000 square miles larger than all the then southern States.

While these steps were being taken by the new government, the fur trade was being reorganized. In 1821 came the coalition of the two great fur companies, the North West Company, a Canadian group, and the Hudson's Bay Company, of London. After the coalition, they continued and did business under the name of Hudson's Bay Company.

In 1824, Dr. John McLoughlin, a chief factor of Hudson's Bay Company, was given control of all the business west of the Rocky Mountains. The headquarters was changed from Astoria to what is now Vancouver, Wash., and the business was greatly extended.

Thus the matters stood in 1827, when the commissioners again met to try to settle the boundary line from the crest of the Rocky Mountains westward to the Pacific Ocean. Again, as in 1818, the American commissioners argued that the line continue west on parallel 49, from the point where it stopped in 1818, and the British again argued that it continue on that line west to the Columbia River, and then that it follow the Columbia to the Pacific Ocean. They deadlocked again on the issue, and in the end decided to renew the old agreement, and allow the Territory to be subject to joint occupation, reserving to each party the right to terminate the agreement by giving a notice of 1 year.

Diplomacy having failed, nature had to take its course. During the period 1827-31, one Hall J. Kelley, a school teacher of Boston, working through Representative Floyd, of Virginia, until the latter's retirement in 1829, and also through Senators Edward Everett, of Massachusetts, and Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri, had several petitions presented to Congress asking recognition of the Oregon country. Nothing came of them. However, in this way the subject was kept before Congress and indirectly before the people.

In 1834 the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church sent the Reverend Jason Lee with four assistants as the first Protestant missionaries to Oregon. They were received kindly by Dr. McLoughlin. He assisted them to locate their mission on the Willamette River, 10 miles north of the present Salem, Ore.

In the interval, Dr. McLoughlin had greatly extended the activities of the Hudson's Bay Co., so that in addition to its extensive fur business it had large acreage of grain, and a special farm for cattle. Also, it manufactured and sold lumber and flour, and did some business in packing salmon.

Following the advent of Rev. Jason Lee in 1834, there came other missionaries in 1835, 1836, and 1837. Also, there came a number of American fur traders and trappers. An active trade in furs by Americans grew up along the coast. All this activity became evident to Lee, and in 1838 he returned east of the Rocky Mountains. He carried with him a

petition signed by the settlers in the Willamette Valley, asking that Congress interest itself in the Territory. They had fears as to what might happen under the powers of joint occupancy, with the great Hudson's Bay Co., of London, becoming more and more dominant in the Territory.

Meanwhile, Senators Linn and Benton, of Missouri, had taken an unusual interest in the Oregon Question. Petitions came up from several State legislatures, urging Congress to interest itself in Oregon. When Lee arrived in Washington, the petition which he had brought from the settlers in Oregon was presented. Both Senators Benton and Linn supported it, and also made public addresses and wrote articles about Oregon. Lee spoke extensively throughout New England to large audiences. But Congress was adamant. No amount of agitation caused its Members to take more than a passive interest.

In 1840 Lee returned to Oregon with a large delegation of missionaries and mission assistants such as a physician, teachers, farmers, carpenters, mechanics, and a blacksmith. He set up a new mission center in what is now Salem. He also brought with him a sawmill and a grist mill, and had thus the making of a community, over and beyond merely a religious mission among the Indians.

#### (b) Local action

At this juncture, and while Congress was adamant in its refusal to give any recognition to Oregon, an event happened which was destined to develop into a local government, different both in its origin and outgrowth from that in any other region of the United States.

Ewing Young, a settler, died on February 15, 1841. He had prospered in Oregon and left considerable property, both real and personal. In the personal property was livestock. These at once presented the problem of herding to prevent their scattering, trespassing and being appropriated by neighbors. To complicate the problem he had died without known heirs in Oregon, and no State or government to which his property could pass by escheat, existed.

The Americans locally were more or less governmental conscious. The missionaries among them were especially so, as they had come from States with established forms of government.

The predominant group in the country was the Hudson's Bay Company and its ex-employees. This group had had a civil administration granted by an act of Parliament of July 1821. Acting under it, law and order had been well preserved in the Territory. But it was not entirely satisfactory to the temper and aspirations of the Americans, who had always before them the fact that they were in a territory open to joint occupancy; they were constantly planning ways and means to strengthen their position.

Clearly the death of Ewing Young raised the problem of civil administration. They had none. Congress had failed them, although as late as 1840 they had set forth in a petition to Congress the dire need they had for civil jurisdictional authority. Following the funeral of Young, the settlers present discussed the situation, and called a meeting to be held on February 18, 1841. At that meeting, most of the settlers of the valley were present, and a committee of organization of nine persons, representing all the different elements in the valley, was chosen. Dr. Ira L. Babcock was elected supreme judge, with probate powers. They also elected a person to act as clerk and recorder, and one to act as sheriff, and eight to act as constables. In the absence of a code of laws, the supreme judge was instructed to act in accordance with the laws of the State of New York. The meeting adjourned to meet the following June 1. On April 15, Judge Babcock appointed the Reverend David Leslie, one of the Methodist missionaries, to act as administrator of the estate of Ewing Young.



In this primitive way, the settlers made a start of self-government. The start advanced haltingly, as the committee on organization failed to report at the June meeting. The meeting adjourned to the first Tuesday in October, and the committee, to draft a constitution and a code of laws, was ordered to meet the first Monday in August. These meetings in turn seem never to have been held, and about the only concrete action which came out of these first efforts were the acts of Judge Babcock and of the Reverend David Leslie as administrator of the estate of Ewing Young. This seems to have been the most pressing matter, and in view of the smallness of the settlement and its peaceful habits, nothing else of importance appears to have been done.

The inroads of bears, panthers, wolves, and other predatory animals on the cattle of the settlers, proved the second rallying point to organize a local government. A meeting ostensibly to discuss this problem was called on February 2, 1843, at the mission building which had now been relocated and was in the present Salem, Ore. At this session, a committee was appointed to call a meeting of the settlers. Such a meeting was held at the home of Joseph Gervais on March 6, 1843. Again a committee was appointed. It was composed of 12 men and was delegated to take means for civil and military protection of this colony.

This committee went into action at what is now Oregon City, Ore. Its meetings were attended by interested citizens. At the conclusion it called a general meeting of the settlers to meet at Champoe, on the Willamette River, on May 2, 1843. At this meeting the committee presented its report favoring the organization of a new government. It soon developed that those present were not of one mind. Not all favored such an organization. The report seems to have been voted down. But the cause was not lost, for a division was called for, and when the count was taken the majority had voted to proceed to organize. The number by which the vote was carried has long been a question of dispute. The commonly accepted count was 52 to 50. But that it was a favorable vote is unquestioned. The discontented element withdrew and those remaining, proceeded to elect a supreme judge with probate powers, a clerk and recorder, a sheriff, and a treasurer, 4 magistrates and 4 constables. In addition, the meeting took an exceptional step. It elected a legislative committee of nine members. This committee constituted the first legislative body elected in Oregon. It was instructed to report at a public meeting the following July 5 (1843).

This committee held its first meeting on May 16 in a room in the old granary of the Methodist Mission, in what is now Oregon City. Its meetings were open. One of its members had a copy of the statutes of Iowa which was bound with the text of the Ordinance of 1787 for the government of the Northwest Territory. The original organic law adopted verbatim many phrases from the Ordinance of 1787 and the organic laws of Iowa. Instead of a governor, this organic law provided for an executive committee of three persons. This plan, however, was found unworkable and later amended.

After unlimited debate, in which the spirit of the old New England town meeting prevailed, the report was adopted, and it became known as the Organic Law of Oregon. Slavery was prohibited, and every free male descendant of a white man inhabitant of the territory was eligible to vote. No provision was made for taxation. The expenses of government were paid by voluntary contributions. This provision was soon found to be unworkable. Finally the large area was divided into legislative districts.

In this way the local people in Oregon, without either assistance or even encouragement by Congress, set up a provisional government, republican in substance, and grounded broadly on ideals of democracy. It

was set up over against the more or less paternalistic system of the powerful Hudson's Bay Company. It was the rule of the majority over and against that of the chosen few. It was a government destined to guide a people who were to colonize the land and cultivate the soil, and, in so doing, to go counter to the Hudson's Bay Company theory of holding the land as a great fur preserve.

#### (c) Colonization

At the time that the organic law was adopted and the provisional government was formed, the practical demands for governmental action were slight, due to the small number of settlers and their peaceful habits.

While these events had been evolving in the Oregon country, events throughout the more settled districts of the Middle West, southern and eastern parts of the country, were developing into what has been characterized as the Oregon fever. It is not the purpose of this article to give the details of these events, as space forbids, and a summary of them will serve the purpose. As a result of these activities, the year 1843 marks the beginning of a series of annual wagon trains, bringing several thousand Americans, men, women, and children, into Oregon, resulting in settlers' claims wherever such seemed most advantageous to them.

With this great influx of new settlers, the newly established government underwent many changes, demanded by the newly arrived settlers. But the changes were in form only, the essence remaining unaltered.

Similarly, the interest of Congress underwent modification. Congress began to discuss land bills and to indicate the number of acres allowable per person. Petitions from the increased number of persons in Oregon were given increasing attention. This meant some members gave vent to their feelings. Some members spoke highly of the territory, while others questioned its value. Senator McDuff, of South Carolina, went to the extreme and said he wouldn't give a pinch of snuff for the whole territory.

Oregon became a campaign issue in 1844. Candidate Polk, for an issue, seized on the fact that Russia in her treaty of 1824 had surrendered her rights to the territory south of 54° 40', and popularized his campaign slogan "54° 40' or fight." It was a political inference that, unless England accepted the old demand of the United States for parallel 49 as the dividing line west of the Rocky Mountains, the United States would abandon that demand and insist on 54° 40' as the line of demarcation. On July 16, 1845, President Polk and James Buchanan, Secretary of State, offered England's Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Packenham, to settle on the 49th parallel. Packenham refused, and Polk withdrew his offer, and said he would insist on the settlement at 54° 40'.

Following the so-called first wagon train of 1843, came succeeding trains in 1844, 1845 and 1846. These newcomers were colonizers. They sought land for homes. They had no interest in furs or fur trade. By 1846 it had become evident to Britain that under the "joint occupancy" clause, still in full force and effect, the colonizing Americans had won. Suddenly and without prior warning, Packenham submitted to Secretary Buchanan a treaty establishing the 49th parallel of north latitude as the dividing line between what is now Canada and the United States, west of the Rocky Mountains. Inasmuch as this had been the proposal of the United States since the issue was first raised in 1818, the treaty was submitted to the Senate of the United States and accepted, in the form submitted by Great Britain, on June 15, 1846.

And thus, without shedding a drop of blood or paying a dollar, the entire territory, known as the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and the western fringes of Montana and Wyoming, came into the domain of the United States. It had been accomplished in good part by American settlers who entered and possessed the land peaceably, under a treaty agreement which had been in

existence for 28 years and for about 25 of those years had been controlled by the Hudson's Bay Company of London.

During this time, the homemade provisional government was functioning, with executive, legislative, and judicial departments. All efforts to get Congress to extend a helping hand had failed. Some authorities in official Washington had taken the position that, until the dividing line was determined, Congress should not interfere. The treaty of June 15, 1846, put an end to that argument. Still Congress delayed.

Meanwhile the people in Oregon grew impatient. They were dissatisfied with certain provisions of the treaty which they considered favored the Hudson's Bay Company. They also disliked the idea that Congress was discussing a bill which provided that the officers of the new Territory, when established, should be appointed by the President. Hadn't they set up their own government in 1843, elected their own officers, and legislated for the welfare of the people of all the Oregon country, and maintained a stable government in working order since then? Why, then, they asked, after having successfully carried the burden without help from Congress, should it be necessary, that the President should appoint their officers and judges? The answer was—precedent. They answered, that in other Territorial governments the local people had not organized an independent government and governed themselves, as had the people of Oregon.

The result was that the provisional president sent J. Quinn Thornton as a representative to Washington. The legislature also sent an emissary, the colorful Joe Meek. Hence, these two men went to Washington to press the merits of the people of the Oregon country.

In December 1846, President Polk urged Congress to grant the Oregon country a Territorial status. Unfortunately, the question of slavery was rearing its ugly head. Bills were introduced in both the Senate and the House. Both contained the antislavery clause. Favoring passage were Senators Douglas (Illinois), Benton (Missouri), Houston (Texas), Webster (Massachusetts), Dix (New York), and Corwin (Ohio); while opposed were Calhoun and Butler (South Carolina), Mason (Virginia), and Foote (Mississippi).

The battle was bitter, and waged without asking or giving quarter, periodically through the year 1847, and until August 13, 1848, when Senator Benton was successful in forcing the bill through. It was signed on August 14, 1848, and became law.

The President appointed Joseph Lane to be the first Territorial governor. It took Lane until March 3, 1849, to reach Oregon and issue a proclamation declaring the Oregon country to have Territorial status. This having been done, Governor Abernethy, the provisional governor, cheerfully surrendered the provisional government in full working order to the Territorial governor.

In conclusion, we see that the Oregon country was called New England by Sir Francis Drake a quarter of a century before there was any permanent white settlement on the Atlantic coast of the United States; that an unusual chain of events delayed its discovery for more than 100 years after lands, both to the north and to the south of it, had been discovered; that the origin of the name "Oregon" had remained hidden, despite the persistent research of scholars; that the Oregon country, which comprises the present States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and the western fringes of Montana and Wyoming, is the only section of the United States to become a part of the Union through colonization and diplomacy, and not as a result of war or purchase; that it established and maintained its own local government for a period of 6 years in the face of the unwillingness of Congress to give aid or even encouragement; and finally, when it was granted Territorial status, the people of

Oregon turned over this local government in full working order, and it became the Territorial government, an accomplishment not equaled by any other State in the Union.

Because of these facts, Oregon is herein represented as the unique prize.

#### IV. DR. JOHN M'LOUGHLIN

Dr. John McLoughlin was born at Rivière-du-Loup, in the Province of Quebec, Canada, on October 19, 1784. He was of mixed Scottish, Irish, and French ancestry. His grandfather, also John McLoughlin, came from Scotland, married Mary Short, an Irish woman, and settled on a farm near Rivière-du-Loup. To them was born a son, John, who succeeded his father on the farm. He was not content to marry into the farming ranks. Across the St. Lawrence River from the farm of the son John, lived Malcolm Fraser, a member of the landed gentry well known in the community, and a person of means. The son John, the farmer, wed Angélique, the daughter of this Malcolm Fraser, the most prominent citizen of Murray Bay. Angélique's mother was Marie Allaire, a French Canadian. Out of this union came a son John, the John of our interest, being the third John in this indicated line. His mother was a Catholic, and the young John was baptized Jean Baptiste at Kamouraska by the local priest; he died in the faith of his mother, and lies buried in Oregon City, Oreg. It is this succession of marriages and births which gave the subject of this sketch the mixture of Scottish, Irish, and French blood, as indicated above.

Little seems to be known of the childhood of this young John McLoughlin. Doubtless he made visits to the home of his grandfather Fraser, where he seems to have been a welcome visitor. Here he may have met two brothers of his mother, Alexander and Simon Fraser. Simon had been a physician, in the Black Watch Regiment of the earlier Napoleonic wars. Alexander was a fur trader, and eventually became a wintering partner of the North West Company. In these two uncles one sees the fingerboards of the road young John McLoughlin was destined to follow.

When not more than 14 years of age, the young man began his medical apprenticeship under Dr. James Fisher, one of the most prominent physicians of his day, with whom he studied for 4½ years. He was admitted to practice at the age of 19. Thus we see the possible influence of Uncle Simon Fraser.

Very soon after having been given a license to practice, young John cast his lot with the North West Company apparently as a result of an attractive promise made to him through the efforts of his Uncle Simon. Whether or not his Uncle Alexander may have stimulated Simon McTavish, the most powerful person in said company, to make the offer, is unknown. But it does not seem a far cry to believe that the young doctor must have heard much of the fur trade in his boyhood associations in the home of his grandfather Fraser.

Thus in 1803 young Dr. McLoughlin began his services under a 5-year contract with the North West Company on a salary of £20 a year. At the end of the period (1808) he was re-engaged, for 3 years, at a salary of £200 a year, which contract was again renewed for 2 years (1811-14) when he became a wintering partner of the company.

He seems to have been popular among his associates who were increasingly annoyed at the manner in which the company was being conducted. It was fast becoming evident that an open clash with the bitter rival, the Hudson Bay Company was in the offing. The rivalry was so keen that the profits of both companies were nearing the vanishing point. Prudence indicated the necessity of a working agreement between the companies. The agents of the North West Company stood firm to drive ahead into disaster.

At this point Dr. McLoughlin led the discontented wintering partners in a rebellion

against the agents. In the end, they were forced to open negotiations in London with the Hudson's Bay Company, which ended in the coalition of the North West Company and the Hudson's Bay Company in March 1821. Dr. McLoughlin was in London during the negotiations, but did not figure directly in them.

Among the assets of the North West Company, which fell to the Hudson's Bay Company, was all the property west of the Rocky Mountains, with headquarters at Astoria, renamed Fort George. On July 10, 1824, Dr. McLoughlin was appointed head of this region known as the Columbia district.

The significance of this appointment to the Pacific Northwest lies in the fact that the treaty of 1818, between Britain and the United States, settled the dividing line between the present Canada and the United States between the Lake of the Woods and the Rocky Mountains, leaving the part west of the Rocky Mountains unsettled and open to future negotiations. This resulted in this district ultimately being open to joint occupancy, and thus ultimately to go to the country which settled it.

Hence, Dr. McLoughlin became a most important personage because, as the chief authority in this district of the Hudson's Bay Company, a distinctly British organization, he was looked upon as the representative of the British interests in the Pacific Northwest. After dealing for 10 years with the Indians of his district, he felt the necessity of having missionary work done among them, so that when Jason Lee and his little band of Methodist missionaries arrived in Oregon in 1834, he welcomed them and aided them in getting established along the Willamette River some 10 miles north of the present Salem.

In 1843 came the first overland train of settlers to Oregon. They were in no sense missionaries, nor in the least interested in the salvation of the Indians. They came for agricultural purposes, and were destined to run counter to the interests represented by Dr. McLoughlin, who wished the country to remain unsettled and the home of fur-bearing animals.

Even though it was evident that there was this conflict of interest, yet Dr. McLoughlin received these settlers pleasantly, made them loans, and ministered to their needs.

The early pioneers were fortunate in that Dr. McLoughlin was in command in the Northwest when they came. It is not that a man less favorably inclined could have prevented their settling, but he could have greatly increased the hardships of their lot which were severe enough at best.

Dr. McLoughlin resigned his position in 1845 and built his home in Oregon City. He took oath in May 1849, and made his declaration to become an American citizen. He died in his home in Oregon City, September 3, 1857.

As evidence of the feeling of the pioneers toward Dr. McLoughlin, the board of directors of the Oregon Pioneer Association passed a resolution at their annual meeting on January 18-19, 1886, asking the Legislature of the State of Oregon to appropriate funds "to erect a suitable monument to the memory of the late Dr. John McLoughlin, of Oregon City, and to place it in the statehouse."

A committee was appointed to bring this to pass. David P. Thompson was chairman. This committee recommended that a life-size oil portrait of the doctor be painted by William Cogswell.

The House Journal of February 5, 1889, shows that this portrait was presented to the State of Oregon at a joint meeting of the house and senate held in the house at 7:30 p. m., all members of both house and senate being present. John Minto presented the portrait on behalf of the Oregon Pioneer Association, and it was accepted by Sylvester Pennoyer, Governor of Oregon, and hung behind the chair of the president of the senate, where it remained till it was burned in the

fire which destroyed the Capitol Building on April 25, 1935.

In presenting this portrait John Minto said:

"In recognition of the worthy manner in which Dr. John McLoughlin filled his trying and responsible position, in the heartfelt glow of a grateful remembrance of his humane and noble conduct to them, the Oregon pioneers leave this portrait with you, hoping that their descendants will not forget the friend of their fathers."

In accepting the portrait on behalf of the State of Oregon Sylvester Pennoyer, Governor, said:

"Then let this picture of the grand old man, whose numerous deeds of charity are inseparably woven in the early history of our State, ever enjoy the place of honor it now holds; and when our children and our children's children shall visit these venerable halls, let them pause before the portrait of this venerable man and do homage to his memory."

#### V. REV. JASON LEE

"Jason Lee was descended from a sturdy Old England and New England ancestry," we are told by his biographer, Cornelius J. Brosnan.

An old country forebear, John Lee, migrated to America in 1634 and became one of the early settlers of Newton, near Cambridge, Mass.

Daniel Lee, the father of Jason Lee, when a youth of 22 years, saw his first Revolutionary action, the Battle of Lexington. Later (June 1776) he enlisted with his brother in the Wadsworth Brigade, and went to reinforce General Washington in his operations in and around New York City, and was in the Battle of White Plains, October 26, 1776, where his brigade suffered losses.

On January 8, 1778, Daniel Lee married Sarah Whitacre, the daughter of a farmer near the town of Stafford, Conn. Sarah also was descended from old and sturdy New England stock. After marriage they lived for some years on a farm near Willington, Conn.; but later, probably about 1798, they migrated to a farm of 400 acres of virgin timber, near the present town of Stanstead, Quebec. When Daniel Lee moved north, his land was considered to be part of Vermont, and remained so until the international survey ran the dividing line between Vermont and the Province of Quebec through this settlement of Connecticut and Vermont pioneers. When the line was ultimately established (1842), Daniel Lee's log house was north thereof, and hence, in the Province of Quebec.

In this log house on June 28, 1803, Jason Lee was born, the youngest of 15 children, 9 boys and 6 girls. The father died when Jason was 3 years of age. Jason received his early education in the village school in Stanstead. At the age of 13, young Lee was self-supporting. He followed the occupation of a farmer boy in a new country. As he expressed it, "He was brought up to hard work," and "had seen the day when he could chop a cord of sugar maple in 2 hours."

He was converted by a Wesleyan missionary in 1826. In his diary he spoke of his conversation: "I saw, I believed, I repented." He continued to work as a manual laborer for 3 years thereafter or until 1829. In that year he entered Wilbraham Academy, at Wilbraham, Mass., a rising Methodist institution where he had the care of all the boys in a large sleeping hall, in which Lee had room No. 13.

Bishop Osmon C. Baker, a classmate of Jason Lee, leaves the following pen picture of him:

"Jason Lee was a large, athletic young man, 6 feet and 3 inches in height, with a fully developed frame and a constitution like iron. His piety was deep and uniform, and his life, in a very uncommon degree, pure and exemplary. In those days of extensive and powerful revivals, I used to observe, with what confidence and satisfaction, seekers of



religion would place themselves under his instruction. They regarded him as a righteous man whose prayers availed much; and when there were indications that the Holy Spirit was moving in the heart of the sinner within the circle of his acquaintance, his warm Christian heart would incite him to constant labor until deliverance would be proclaimed to the captive."

After graduation at Wilbraham in 1830, Lee served as a teacher in the Stanstead Academy and preached in the adjoining towns, and continued in this capacity until the opening came to go to Oregon. While contemplating how he was to get to Oregon, he saw in a Boston newspaper that Capt. Nathaniel Wyeth, of Cambridge, Mass., had returned from Oregon and was planning to go there again the following spring. He hastened to Boston and arranged to accompany Wyeth on his second trip, which was to leave Independence, Mo., in April 1834.

The meeting with Wyeth was in November 1833. Between that time and the date set for the departure to Oregon, Jason Lee went about New England, accompanied by two Indian boys whom Wyeth had brought with him from Oregon, preaching and addressing various missionary groups where collections were taken for his work in Oregon. The Indian boys drew record crowds. One such meeting was held in Lynn, Mass. The *Zion Herald* published a graphic account thereof in part as follows:

"Last Sabbath evening there was an address by Rev. Jason Lee, missionary to the Flat Heads. It was one of the most pleasant meetings ever held in Lynn, of a missionary character. Long before the time appointed to commence, the house was thronged to overflowing, and the audience hung upon the lips of the speakers with such an interest that it could not be mistaken. The collection did honor to Lynn; it amounted to \$100."

Monday, April 28, 1834, the cavalcade headed by Nathaniel Wyeth, of which Jason Lee and his party of four companions were a part, headed out of St. Louis for Oregon. Lee, in a letter written en route, said that Wyeth's party was the most profane company I think that I was ever in.

En route Lee preached at Fort Hall, a brief, but excellent and appropriate exhortation on July 27, 1834, noted as the first formal Protestant religious observance to be held in the vast interior lying west of the Rocky Mountains. Captain Wyeth remained to finish Fort Hall, and Lee and his party proceeded to Fort Boise under the escort of Thomas McKay, and his Hudson's Bay brigade. From this point they journeyed alone to Fort Walla Walla, arriving September 1. While here, Wyeth and his party rejoined them, and together they proceeded to Fort Vancouver where they arrived September 15, 1834, warmly welcomed by Dr. John McLoughlin.

At the suggestion and under the guidance of Dr. McLoughlin, Jason Lee and his companions, Daniel Lee, his nephew, and Messrs. Courtney N. Walker, Cyrus Shepard, and Philip L. Edwards, located their mission on the east bank of the Willamette River, 10 miles north of the present city of Salem.

But Lee soon became convinced that he must have reinforcements, and among them should be women.

Accordingly on March 26, 1838, Lee started on his return trip to New York, carrying with him a petition signed by 36 Americans, including every member of the mission. This memorable document is said to have been inspired by Lee. The petition set forth the virtues of the Oregon country and its commercial advantages, and urged the United States to take formal and speedy possession. The document is dated March 16, 1838, and was presented to the Senate on January 28, 1839, by Senator Linn. Thus early did Lee interest himself in the political welfare of Oregon.

On his journey, he spoke at Alton, Ill., St. Louis, Carlinville, Jacksonville, Springfield, Peoria, and Chicago. In New York he impressed the board of managers of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Church with the importance of the work. As a result they had him go on three extended speaking tours, one in and about Philadelphia and Washington; another in New England, from Connecticut to Canada, and the third through New York State. He spoke to crowded houses. In Hartford, Conn., by way of illustration, "hundreds went away unable to gain admittance into the church;" and thousands thus had Oregon and its importance brought to their attention.

The missionary society chartered the sailing vessel *Lausanne* to carry a large party of missionaries (51 persons) and their supplies to Oregon. This group was purely for missionary purposes. On October 9, 1839, the party set sail. The *Lausanne* dropped anchor at Fort Vancouver June 1, 1840, after a voyage of almost 8 months. Dr. McLoughlin greeted them most cordially and entertained them at the fort, providing comfortable accommodations such as a private sitting room and special dining tables.

The site of the so-called Old Mission on the Willamette was fast proving to be unsatisfactory. It was low, malarial, and subject to inundation. Lee had brought with him machinery for both a sawmill and a gristmill. There was no location for them at the old mission, while at Chemeketa, 10 miles to the south, was a stream with sufficient water in winter to operate them. Thus it was that the machinery for the mills was sent there immediately. When the sawmill was ready it began to cut lumber for a house for Lee, in 1841, and for another house called the "Parsonage," for the missionary teachers; and finally, for the new Indian school buildings. This later became Willamette University.

But soon the mission fell into evil ways. The Indian population had been depleted by diseases of the white man to which the Indians succumbed in great numbers. Dissatisfaction arose among the missionaries and their various assignments. Complaints continued to reach the missionary headquarters in New York. Many of these were from dissatisfied missionaries who had returned to New York from Oregon. The letters from the board, touching these complaints, convinced Lee that he should return to New York in the hope of making satisfactory explanations.

Accordingly, in late November 1843, Lee bade farewell to his Chemeketa friends and associates and headed for New York with his only daughter, then nearly 2 years old, in company with Gustavus Hines and wife.

He appeared before his board on July 1, and continued to do so until July 10, 1844. In the end, the board cleared him of the charges which had been preferred by his dissatisfied associates. But it was too late to return him to Oregon. The board had previously appointed his successor who was then in Oregon.

Lee left soon afterwards and went to be with a sister at Stanstead, his boyhood home. Here he was stricken with an illness from which he died on March 12, 1845. He was buried in the graveyard at Stanstead, where his body remained till on June 15, 1906, when his remains were moved to the Lee Mission Cemetery at Salem, Oreg.

On October 26, 1920, an oil painting of Jason Lee was presented to the State of Oregon. The portrait was done by Mr. Vesper George, of Boston, Mass. The funds for the same were provided by the Oregon Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The portrait was hung behind the chair of the speaker of the House of Representatives in the State Capitol in Salem, Oreg., where it hung until destroyed when the building burned on April 25, 1935.

The portrait was presented by Thomas A. McBride, justice, Oregon State Supreme Court. He said in part:

"The precious jewel of a commonwealth; the one thing above all others which it should treasure, is the memory of those grand and self-sacrificing men and women who laid the foundations of its greatness and prosperity."

"One of these treasured memories is the life and work of Jason Lee, the founder of American civilization in Oregon. Lee combined the fervor of a missionary, the foresight of a seer, and the patriotism of a loyal citizen."

The portrait was accepted on the part of the State by Ben W. Olcott, Governor of Oregon. He said in part:

"Unhesitatingly I say that Jason Lee was Oregon's most heroic figure. By every right of achievement, by every right of peaceful conquest, this portrait of Jason Lee should adorn the halls of the capitol building in our State, as long as those capitol buildings stand."

#### COMMITTEE SERVICE OF SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn my attention to an entirely different subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an excerpt from an article entitled "MORSE Wins Support of Portland Unions," which was published in the Oregon Journal of Tuesday, February 3, 1953.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**MORSE WINS SUPPORT OF PORTLAND UNIONS**  
Organized labor in Portland—the A. F. of L., CIO, railroad brotherhoods, and independent longshoremen—today joined in a chorus of protest against removal of Senator WAYNE MORSE from the Senate Labor Committee.

The vigorous complaints had their origin in a statement made by Chuck Hoffman, delegate for A. F. of L. electrical workers to the Portland Central Labor Council. He told the council Monday night, "MORSE is fighting alone. We should give him support."

At his suggestion the council passed a motion requesting the national executive board of the A. F. of L., now in session at Miami, Fla., to protest the disciplining of the Oregon Senator.

CIO leaders in Portland said they are taking similar action. Longshoremen said they had always supported MORSE and were with him now. Top leaders of the railroad brotherhoods were attending meeting in Salt Lake City but their offices said the brotherhoods were strongly in sympathy with the action of the Portland Central Labor Council.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks an excerpt from an article entitled "Central Council Urges A. F. of L. To Protest MORSE's Removal From Labor Group of Senate," published in the Oregonian of Tuesday, February 3, 1953.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Portland Central Labor Council Monday night determined to prod the A. F. of L. executive council, sitting at Miami, Fla., into protesting the removal of Senator WAYNE MORSE from the Senate Labor Committee.

But it rejected a proposal to call on the same authority to clean up the New York waterfront mess where crime investigators have charged racketeering, corruption, cargo

pilferage to members of the A. F. of L. longshoremen's union.

In its move to stir the A. F. of L. council into action on the removal of MORSE from the Senate Labor Committee, the Portland Council urged that all international unions also be enlisted in the drive to get him back.

#### AMERICA'S NATURAL RESOURCES— ELECTRIC POWER POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish now to address myself to another subject.

Mr. President, it is very important that I do some of my committee work on the floor of the Senate, because I am well aware of the fact that, it being Friday afternoon, a good many of my colleagues necessarily are out of the city and will perhaps appreciate my doing my floor committee work in their absence, but making available to them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of that work.

I wish to announce that today I shall give the first of a series of speeches in the Senate on the general subject of our natural resources and their development and use. I shall dedicate these speeches to one of the great liberals of our history, one of the great students of natural resource problems, and one of the greatest statesmen who ever trod the floor of the Senate of the United States. I refer, of course, to the late great Senator from Nebraska, George Norris. We cannot fill his shoes, Mr. President, but we can try to walk in his footsteps. We can note and follow his footprints of statesmanship. I believe it to be very important, at this particular time, with all the conflicting proposals which one hears with reference to what should happen to our natural resources, that we reflect on some of the great lessons and teachings of George Norris, because I hold to the view that, conservationist that he was, he was thinking decades ahead on the question of the kind of heritage and legacy we would leave to American boys and girls a century hence, from the standpoint of the natural resources of our country. The great Norris recognized that the streams, forests, and public domain of the United States belong to the people of the United States, and that the people of each generation hold those resources as trustees for Americans yet to be born.

Because I feel so deeply about the problem of conserving, preserving, and protecting the natural resources of our country for generations of Americans yet unborn, I propose today to give the first of a series of speeches which I shall deliver in the months ahead on the entire problem of natural resources.

#### CONGRESSIONAL ELECTRIC POWER POLICY

Mr. President, as I have just said, the natural resources of the country are held by the people of our generation in trust for the happiness and welfare of future generations of Americans.

We must be on guard against any and all attempts to waste and exploit these resources for selfish economic interests of those who are inclined to place their profits above the general welfare. Therefore, I propose to deliver in the Senate from time to time over the next few months, a series of speeches dealing with some of the vital problems and

questions involved in developing and maintaining a sound conservation program for our country.

Such a program is necessary if we are to keep faith with the historic work in the field of conservation conducted by two liberal and sound conservationists—Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot. I plan to deliver this series of speeches because I am satisfied that the natural resources planks of the Republican platform, if enacted into legislation by the Eisenhower administration, would prove to be a serious threat to a sound conservation program, and, would constitute in fact, a wasting of the economic and defense potentialities of the streams and forests and public domain of our country.

#### LEADERSHIP OF THE UNITED STATES TODAY

Today, America stands as a foremost leader of the democracies in the world. Nations large and small look to us for guidance and aid. With the threat of communism challenging the free peoples throughout the world, the United States cannot afford to falter in its dedication to the democratic quest for constant improvement of the lot of the people.

All of us recognize the great political contributions that our democracy has made to our world. These facts are well known. America, the industrial giant, has done as much to foster and protect this political heritage of all freemen. Our technological attainments give us the tools with which to win the battles against armed aggression, and the struggle in civilian life for ever-higher standards of living.

#### WHAT IS THE BASIS OF OUR INDUSTRIAL MIGHT?

For generations, infant America struggled along in an inconspicuous way, while other nations assumed leadership in the world of industry and trade. Then suddenly a young giant America leaped to the fore as a leader of free men everywhere.

It is true that we have developed men of great technical genius. Also, we have made undreamed improvements in tools and in industrial arts that shot us forward generations in a few brief decades. But upon what were all these things based? What really made possible our vast mass production in recent years? I believe one of the answers will be found in the great prime mover, electric power.

#### PRIVATE INITIATIVE AND INVESTMENT

Many factors enter into this unparalleled record of achievement. Private initiative and industry are of basic importance. We must recognize the vast and steady accomplishments of private industry here and throughout the world, down through the years. But this alone is not enough to account for the tremendous strides the United States has made recently.

#### THE GREAT CONSERVATIONISTS

We must look for something more than private initiative and private accomplishments—great as these things are. During the past five decades there has been a constant struggle between those who believed that our natural resources and water power were for the benefit of all the people, and those who believed that they were for private exploitation. The fight on behalf of the people was led

by such great conservationists as Teddy Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, and George Norris. Out of this long struggle, which took place in bitter fights in and out of the halls of Congress, a great national electric power policy was evolved during the last generation.

#### THE EVOLUTION OF OUR NATIONAL POWER POLICY

This national power policy was slow in developing. At times it seemed as if it never would materialize. However, after endless and weary battles, a national policy was formulated in plainly written laws of Congress that told our people, all agencies of the Federal Government, and the world, that at last the United States was on its way to preserving its natural resources and water power for the benefit of all the people. What were these policies, and what did Congress say?

#### DAMS SHALL GENERATE ELECTRICITY

The first great pillar in our national power policy, I might say our basic one, arose when Federal dams were first constructed, although no power use was made of their priceless waters. It is hard to believe that for many years all these potential low-priced billions of kilowatt-hours were wasted to America. It is a cliché of economics that the labor of a human being is perishable, and, if unused, is gone forever. It is equally true that water emptied into the seas has a potential for power every bit as perishable. Once it has rushed beyond river banks, it is beyond recall.

After a historic struggle, Congress provided that Federal dams should include facilities for generating electricity. This was a long time ago. It first occurred in the Reclamation Act of 1906, and has been continued ever since.

#### PUBLIC PREFERENCE IN POWER SALES

Let us now consider the next principle that was determined by Congress for our national power policy. The Government is developing public property—streams and vast networks of rivers—belonging to the people. It is doing so with funds that are derived from all the people. Therefore, it is both logical and reasonable that such public property, developed with public funds, should grant a preference to the same public—or their public or nonprofit agencies—which made such construction possible.

It seems incredible, Mr. President, that after a generation of struggle, we should still hear today the generation-old private-utility chant that the privately owned and publicly operated utilities should be treated alike in receiving the use of power generated by public projects.

The public-preference principle is no accidental development in congressional law. It has a long and honorable history, based upon years and years of study which culminated into law. In the Reclamation Act that was passed in 1906, Congress stated this principle of preference in power sales to public agencies and cooperatives. Congress did so again in the Raker Act. A similar policy was followed in the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, and in the Boulder Canyon Act of 1928. When Congress passed the Tennessee Valley Act of 1933, the public-preference policy was reiterated. The same was true of the Rural



Electrification Act of 1936, the Bonneville Act of 1937, and the Fort Peck Act of 1938.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Oregon to say that the preference for municipal and cooperative power was first established when Theodore Roosevelt was President of the United States?

Mr. MORSE. The principle of it was established in 1906.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was established in the Reclamation Act, which the late Senator Newlands, of Nevada, had a great deal to do with, I believe.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So it did not begin in 1933, under Franklin Roosevelt, but began under Theodore Roosevelt. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Congress continued these clearly enunciated views in the Reclamation Act of 1939; and 5 years later the preference clause was continued in the Flood Control Act of 1944. Thus, the next pillar in our national electric power policy, namely, public preference to public non-profit bodies, is a long and well-established congressional doctrine.

#### LOW INTEREST RATES

Natural resources are the property of all the people, and must be preserved and developed for their benefit.

Mr. President, I hope that by the time I conclude the series of speeches which I intend to make in the Senate during the next few months, I shall at least have broadened the understanding of the American people so that they will indubitably realize that they, and they alone, own the streams and the other great natural resources of the United States. Those resources do not belong to the private utilities of our country. The forests do not belong to the lumber companies of our country, to be used for exploitation purposes. The public domain does not belong to those who would seek to so use it that they would change the western plains of America into an eroded China. The public domain belongs to the people of our generation in trust for future generations of Americans, and in the great natural-resource fight which will be waged in this Congress against an administration which, in my judgment, unless it is checked, will exploit our natural resources for selfish interests, I see an arousing of the American people to a clearer understanding of their vested interest in their own natural resources.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. When the Government builds a dam across a river or stream, it is, of course, the money of all the people that goes into the dam. Therefore, is it not right, proper, and logical that all the people should benefit from such construction rather than merely a few?

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator from Alabama, and I commend the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DOUGLAS), both of whom are now on the floor and both of whom have been so kind as to contribute to my discussion of this problem, for the fights they have put up on the floor of the Senate for years in support of the basic principle I have just enunciated. They are in support of our mutual view that it is the obligation of the Congress of the United States to protect the heritage of all the people in the natural resources of this country. Let me say to my friend from Alabama that if we do not remain constantly on guard, the movement which is under way to exploit our natural resources will take the form of law. That is the way the selfish end of private interests will be accomplished. If we are not on our guard, when multiple-purpose dams, to be built with the taxpayers' money, are being authorized, there will be inserted in the authorization act a sleeper clause which will give to the private utilities the power at bus bar. If the private utilities are given the power at bus bar, then we might as well give them the dam, because if they control the power at bus bar, then we might as well give them the dam, because if they control the power at bus bar, they control the dam. It would be cheaper for them to get their bus-bar proposal through than to own the dam. That is why the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Illinois and other liberal Senators have fought so hard during our terms in the Senate for the building of Government transmission lines to load centers, because without a gridback system of Government-built transmission lines to load centers, then the dams are made really and in fact the property of the private utilities at bus bar. That raises the question of entering into fair, equitable, and reasonable contracts with all distributors of power, including private utilities.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield to the Senator from North Dakota in a moment. My record speaks for itself. I have supported on the floor of the Senate proposals which will give to private utilities fair contracts. But, Mr. President, the protection of the legitimate rights of the private utilities does not mean an emasculation of the preference clause. It does not mean that the Government is to use the taxpayers' money to build the dams and generate the power, and then discriminate in favor of the private utilities. After all, it is the interest of the taxpayers that ought to come first, and the preference clause is included to protect the ownership of the public in publicly generated power. I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, not only for yielding to me, but for giving me an opportunity to tell him how much I appreciate what he is saying here today. It is because of the fact that we have had a group of liberals on the Senate floor for the past 8 or 9 years that we, in my State, have 612 miles of transmission lines

built by the Bureau of Reclamation. We have there eight cooperatives which, by their united efforts, have secured a loan from the Government of \$9,500,000, making the total of nearly \$25,000,000.

I want my distinguished friend from Oregon to know that that takes care of 35,000 farmers in the very center of North Dakota, farmers who never could have obtained electric power had the Government, as the Senator has suggested, not stepped in to help them.

Furthermore, these loans are amortized. Within 45 years, those farmers are going to own that line. They are going to own the steam plant, and they are going to get the power from Garrison Dam, one of the greatest dams now being built. The fight is on now in North Dakota, the very fight my distinguished friend has just mentioned, namely, whether under the so-called preference clause the private utilities are to get an advantage over farm lines owned by the farmers' cooperatives.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his contribution to this discussion. I am sure I need not say to the people of North Dakota anything about the record of the Senator from North Dakota in supporting public-power developments. I am sure the people of his State know his fine record, and I think it was one of the main reasons why he was returned to the Senate last November by the very complimentary vote he received across North Dakota.

All I want to say to my friend from North Dakota—and I say it to him as a Republican—is that the Independent Party welcomes him at this session of the Congress, to stand with it, as it will stand with him, in the fight we are going to have to make, in my judgment, to protect the people of the United States from certain groups within the Republican Party that are out to exploit the streams of America for the benefit of the private utilities.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that natural resources are the property of all the people, and must be preserved and developed for their benefit. It is proper and reasonable that the Government utilize its own agencies in developing programs for the preservation of those resources.

Consequently, under a wise congressional policy, the Federal Government has used its own lending power in order to make available to public projects, the low interest rates which the Government itself enjoys. Accordingly, another vital link in a congressional-power policy has been the granting of low interest rates to borrowers, where Government funds are used for the development of public property, or the supplying of essential public electric power services not available previously at reasonable rates.

The soundness of this policy is attested to by the fact that such loans have made possible large scale development of public resources and widespread use of power generated from such public projects. The fact is that people are prospering and enjoying electric rates less than one-half of what rates were before Government programs developed our natural resources. This is conclusive

evidence that such low rates have been of tremendous benefit to all the people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Illinois correct in his understanding that the interest rate on loans to the REA Co-ops is approximately 2 percent?

Mr. MORSE. That is my understanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is it not also true that while the 2 percent rate is less than the rate on long-term Government bonds, it is higher than the rate on short-term borrowings of the Government?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that to the degree to which the Government gets its capital from the short-term market and loans to the cooperatives, there is no net loss of interest?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

#### POWER FOR BENEFIT OF DOMESTIC AND RURAL CONSUMERS

In forging this legislation, Congress wanted the people to get the benefit of such power. This is eminently reasonable because the people's tax dollars made such projects possible. And in its legislative policy Congress declared that such power be used for the particular benefit of domestic and rural consumers. This policy was announced in the Tennessee Valley Act of 1933, and in the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. This legislative policy was continued in the Bonneville Act of 1937, and repeated in the Fort Peck Act of 1938.

Only 10.9 percent of all farms in the United States were receiving central-station electric service by 1935.

Since its establishment, REA has greatly stimulated the extension of service into rural areas. Between 1935 and 1953, about 4,000,000 additional farms had been connected to power lines by all agencies, public and private. More than half of the farms connected to central-station lines since 1935 received electric service from REA-financed systems.

REA estimated that 4,740,849 of the farms recorded in the 1950 census, or 88.1 percent, were electrified by June 30, 1952.

Mr. President, that is dramatic in social and economic action. It is a miracle which has taken place before the eyes of the American people in the short span of years from 1935 to 1952—an increase in the electrification of the farms of America from 10.9 to 88.1 percent.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the part which the REA has played in this marvelous development of rural electricity has not cost the Federal Government or the taxpayers anything?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. It has not cost the taxpayers anything. It has been self-liquidating in nature. But I say it has done more than that; it has created for the taxpayers of America a tremendous wealth, because out of this program there has been derived the wealth-creating production

electrification of the farms of America has made possible. From our great natural resources there has been created a new economic wealth in the form of the production of power the like of which it is difficult to find a comparable example of in the history of economic life in America.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is making a magnificent address. He spoke about our resources earlier in his address. Is it not also true that REA has contributed much to making possible diversified crop planning, wise land use, and a balanced agriculture which not only has done so much for the farmer but has also made a great contribution to the preservation of America's precious soil?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Alabama is absolutely correct. He knows—and it is good to get it into the Record—that the great advance in electrifying the farms of America has, in many respects, revolutionized American agriculture. Not only has it increased the diversity of agriculture, but in the section of the country from which the Senator comes, in fact, throughout the great Southland of America, the bringing of electrification to the farms has had economic and social benefits which even yet cannot be fully comprehended. But they are all to the good. They have resulted in tremendous economic and social advancement for all our people.

But, Mr. President, let us stress this point. The fact is that it would not have happened if we had left the job to the private utilities of America. Why? Because the private utilities do not stretch their lines into the backward areas. They do not go into the areas where consumers in large numbers do not already exist. They wait for the population to be there. They have not made the contribution they should have made to the development of agriculture in America by stretching their lines and helping to create a desire for people to go into the backward areas and bring land there under cultivation.

That is why I think it is very important that we keep in mind the great principle of Lincoln when he talked about the relationship of government to the needs of the people. He was constantly reminding us—and I have always said to my Republican friends that they should not forget this basic tenet of Republicanism—that it is the duty of a nation composed of self-governing people, such as ours, to do for all the people what needs to be done to advance their general welfare, what they cannot so well do for themselves, and which, by doing for them, will vastly increase the economic wealth and productivity of our Nation.

Oh, it is not possible to get away from that social concept and economic concept of the great Lincoln in regard to the relationship of government to the economic needs of the people. Yet we hear references to creeping socialism, some trying to delude the American people into thinking that when the Government constructs great multiple-purpose dams and builds great grid-back transmission lines, it is participating in creeping socialism.

Let us not forget what happened just a few short months ago. Let us not for-

get that the issues of the campaign then being waged are still the issues facing the American people. Now that the time has come when the people can reflect upon some of the fear arguments presented to them during the campaign, I believe they will see a little more clearly the relationship between the development of the great natural resources of our country for the benefit of our people and the preservation of a private-property system and the so-called free-enterprise system.

When he hear people talking in demagogic fashion about creeping socialism because we propose to preserve for all the people the Nation's natural resources, and develop the potentiality of our streams for all the people, their arguments answer themselves.

Just ask them to look at the Hoover Dam and the economic development around it; to look at the Bonneville Dam and the economic development around it; to the Grand Coulee Dam and the economic development around it. In the case of each and every one of these multiple-purpose dams, if we look at the economic development around each one of them, we find a prosperous, growing private enterprise system, with businesses coming in which never would have come in, if the Government had not built the dam. That is what I call co-ordination and teamwork between Government and private enterprise.

The fact is, Mr. President, that the best guaranty of the preservation of the private-enterprise system is not to let monopoly gain a stranglehold on the Nation's natural resources, because monopoly cannot be reconciled with private enterprise. Monopoly chokes to death private enterprise. Monopoly merely saves the profits for the "big boys." Monopoly merely follows the table-crumb theory, of brushing off just enough of the economic sustenance from the table to keep the masses satisfied.

Mr. President, that is not enough. The masses of our people are entitled to be partners and participants in the development of the natural resources of our country. That is why I say to my liberal friends in the Senate, go to your posts. Get ready to fight, because I am satisfied that in this session of Congress we are going to have to put up a fight against devious attempts to take away from the American people their control over their own property, represented by their heritage and their legacy in the natural resources of our country.

Mr. President, I say that although we have made great progress since 1935, that is not enough. Electric rates were formerly far too high. Use was not free or widespread because the rates were prohibitive. So Congress forged the next essential link in its Federal power policy. This related to the sale of such power. In various acts, Congress provided that such power be sold at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles. This basic congressional principle was set forth in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, the Bonneville Act of 1937, the Fort Peck Act of 1938, and the Flood Control Act of 1944.

How wise Congress was can now be judged by the vastly lowered costs since this policy was adopted—which are less



than half what they formerly were—and the resulting tremendous upsurge in popular consumption of all kinds.

#### ENCOURAGING WIDE USAGE AND PREVENTING MONOPOLY

One essential still remained in a sound Federal power policy. Accordingly, in the development of congressional electric power policy, the next principle enunciated by Congress was that where a Federal project generates power, in disposing of it the marketing policies should be designed to encourage the widest possible use of such power, and, at the same time, to prevent its monopoly. This principle was embodied in the Tennessee Valley Authority of 1933, the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the Bonneville Act of 1937, the Fort Peck Act of 1938, and the Flood Control Act of 1944.

#### PIONEERING WORK OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

Laws that Congress passes are often legislative mandates indicating the general outline which national policies should follow—blueprints for the work to be undertaken. When such legislation exists, it is usually the technical knowledge, initiative, resourcefulness, planning, trial and error of the responsible executive agencies that translate the blueprints into actual Federal power programs. Consequently, when we speak of the development of a congressional power policy, we have to examine the operation of the executive agencies and departments that carry out these congressional laws.

We must pay tribute to the Federal executives and the corps of civilian employees who are responsible for manning these Federal agencies. Many of the tremendous achievements that have taken place in the field of national power and federally aided power programs are attributable to the technical know-how of these agencies.

Our Nation has been slow to develop a tradition of public service which can be our surest safeguard against venality and sloth in Government. The men and women who have dedicated themselves to providing cheap and plentiful power for the people have also contributed to the creation of a tradition of unselfish devotion to the public welfare. This is a little recognized but important by-product of public power.

While such persons generally could earn several times as much pay in private industry, a devotion to their Government and the people compels them to give their best, year in and year out, regardless of the low pay and the often humiliating circumstances that commonly accompany work for the Government, such as an attack upon them by the Congress, going so far as even to deny them pay for a period of months, while they devote themselves unselfishly and patriotically to the development of the natural resources of our country. Of course, I refer to the Michael Straus case, and I digress to pay my respects to Michael Straus for the interest he has manifested in the people's stake in the Nation's natural resources.

Notwithstanding all this, in the various Federal agencies that administer the national electric power policy today, we

have a corps of men and women, finely trained public servants, who should be a source of real pride to any democracy. Here we have a great operating organization. The men and women have been trained for years, at tremendous cost to our Government, in order to perform these technical tasks. They stand ready and willing to serve the American people now as they always have before. This has been one of our main sources of strength and inspiration in carrying out the policies that have been enunciated by the Congress in the various acts on Federal power.

#### WHAT THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION HAS ACCOMPLISHED

Let us glance at a single typical illustration of power progress, the Rural Electrification Administration, which now serves about 4 million consumers in 46 States, Alaska, and the Virgin Islands. With an average of 5 persons to the family, this program is serving about 20 million people today.

In 1935, when the Government sought to aid the people in the rural sections who were living in dismal kerosene darkness, the usual cry went up: "It can't be done." There was good reason to accept this conclusion. For nearly a quarter of a century the private utilities had attempted to do a similar job. Only they had gone down the main highways for the most part, leaving the backroads and hinterland farm country to the primitive and hand-labor methods of their grandfathers.

So pursuant to Federal law, REA was given the supposedly impossible job of going into such backwoods territory where there were only 2 or 3 potential consumers to the mile. Surely, no more difficult task could have faced any Federal agency. Yet with courage, resourcefulness, and technical skill, REA waded in. Look at what this Federal agency has done for some 20,000,000 American rural residents as a result of the enlightened power policy of your Congress.

In 1935, when the REA began its operations, a mile of rural line cost about \$2,000, according to the Federal Power Commission. In a comparatively short time, this healthy young REA agency was building a mile of line for \$1,000, and in some instances as low as \$600.

Moreover, it was a better mile of line. Whereas the previous "battleship" construction was designed for city use, the REA pioneers designed an entirely new type of line that was specifically adapted to rural territory.

In addition, the REA program through cooperatives is a model in local democracy and private ownership. Equally important, the rural folks are paying back their Federal loans promptly.

The total repayments of principal and interest on these loans have been \$394 million. This sum includes \$50 million that were paid before they were actually due and only \$722,000 were delinquent.

This means that only one-fifth of 1 percent of the total amount loaned is more than 30 days overdue. Let me repeat that figure—one-fifth of 1 percent. I venture the opinion that no bank or financial institution in the United States

has such a marvelous record of collections. And remember, these loans were made in the heretofore underdeveloped areas of rural America.

I am sure Senators will be interested to know that in the 17 years of the existence of REA only a little more than \$40,000 has been written off as uncollectible.

#### REA SETS THE PATTERN

As a result of our wise congressional power policy—in this case loans to local organizations of rural citizens—REA set the pattern for the private utilities as well. Whereas previously these utilities had almost completely disregarded local customers—except at prohibitive rates and charges which the country folks could not afford to pay—now they began competing fiercely with the REA cooperatives for this newly developed rural business.

What are the results of this proved Federal power policy in the case of REA? In 1935 before the REA was started, only about 10 percent of the rural areas and farms had high-line or central-station electric service. Today, thanks to a wise congressional power policy, nearly 90 percent of the rural residents of this country have such electric service. And at rates which are half or less of what they formerly paid.

Truly, electricity is now the perennial, cheap, uncomplaining hired hand of the countryside. Need any finer illustration be given of the proven and tested nature of a wise congressional power policy? The overwhelming facts speak forcefully for themselves.

In the words of Norris, the father of national electric power policy:

How marvelous that this water, which once went wasted to the sea, can be put to work in this way to make life easier for humanity—lighten the burden of the woman at her washtub and in the kitchen, to ease the labor and toil of the farmer in his barn, to turn factory wheels which will provide payrolls and produce things to add to human comfort and security.

#### TECHNICAL KNOW-HOW

As a result of this tremendous accomplishment in all the Federal agencies having to do with the conservation and development of our water and power resources, there is available today a vast field of technical knowledge that was not in existence previously. In a real sense of the word, these agencies have been pioneers. They have drawn the best from private technology, and by adaptation and creation, they have increased, tremendously, the technological base of our power knowledge.

New problems and new situations have been a constant challenge. From wise policies of field work and experimentation by Federal agencies, we have developed our technical grasp on power matters. It is impossible to estimate the value of such technical knowledge and its benefits to the public users and private industry alike.

#### TECHNICAL AID FOR THE PEOPLE

From the beginning of our Government to date, Congress has attempted to pass legislation to provide essential public services that would enable it to do for all the people things that they could not do for themselves.

In the field of national electric power policy, the same thing has been true. Instead of being the helpless victims of their own lack of technical information, or being denied better ways of living because they could not afford engineering advice in order to attain such ends, now the people, or their agents, can turn to their Government departments for technical aid in the field of power. This is a very healthy sign of democracy. It permits the people to be educated, and then to do things for themselves.

Again let us take the illustration of the REA. This is no nationwide Federal bureaucracy. On the contrary, it consists of local organizations of local people, governing themselves. It is a good example of self-government of a free people put to work in developing their own economic life.

They choose their own board of directors and president. They hire their own employees to manage their own projects and they lay down the policies that shall be pursued.

This is democracy at work. It is a far cry from the claims of bureaucracy and Washington domination that the public power opponents describe in charges which have no relation to the actual facts.

Every form of liberty and freedom we possess today is the result of a long and bitter struggle against ruthless and selfish enemies. Once such freedoms are established they become the very essence of our liberty, and freemen should fight to preserve them.

Throughout the land, selfish forces are at work seeking to confuse the people, and trying to make them believe that the highly profitable interests of a few are the same as the needs of all the people who use electricity. In over a generation of time, the people and their representatives in Congress have forged out a wise national resources program that is designed to preserve our possibly dwindling heritage of natural resources and power for all the people.

It is a wise policy which has ripened into rich accomplishments. It is a sound policy that assures America of continued progress in the forward march of democracy.

Low electric rates, more productive farms, arduous tasks made lighter, comfort and leisure, thriving and expanding industry are but some of the results. But we cannot afford to plume ourselves upon the past.

Intelligent as we Americans are, we might as well admit that we continually underestimate the growing needs for electric power for basic industries, vital both to defense and to the civilian economy. We underestimated in World War II and we underestimated in the present crisis. It is time we got out of the habit of inadequate power programming.

Our experience shows that we have a basically sound program. We must use that program to meet our continuing problem with the boldness and imagination that characterize our people. If we will—and we must—then we shall truly keep faith with the great Teddy Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, and the great George Norris.

XCIX—68

**PUBLIC POWER PREFERENCE AND PUBLIC POWER TRANSMISSION LINES—RESOLUTION OF WASCO COUNTY POMONA POWER COMMITTEE, THE DALLES, OREG.**

Mr. President, I now present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Wasco County Pomona Power Committee of The Dalles, Oreg., favoring continuation of public preference provisions in Federal power legislation and congressional authorization for the construction of Government transmission facilities for bringing public power to nonprofit cooperatives and public bodies. I request that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas in a democracy the government is not something different and apart from the people, but is, instead, the representative and instrumentality of the people, and what the government owns the people own; and, therefore, the government must always use government property for the greatest benefit of the largest number of the people; and

Whereas this basic principle of democracy has, since the days of Theodore Roosevelt and continuing without interruption to date, always been a part of the law of the land applicable to the hydroelectric generating facilities constructed and operated by the Government, by virtue of the provisions in different statutes under which the people, through governmental subdivisions or mutual self-help organizations such as cooperatives, have been given the first right to purchase the electric power generated by their Government-operated dams; and

Whereas to retain the integrity of this basic democratic principle, it is essential that the relationship between the Government and the people be direct, and without any intervening agent in the position of a toll-taker to profit both from the operations of the Government and the people, and, as a practical matter, it is absolutely necessary that the Government construct all transmission facilities which are needed to bring the power to the geographical points where it can be taken and used by people's organizations; and

Whereas eastern Oregon has been mutually benefited by this basic law, giving farmers' organizations the power to deliver to the widely scattered farms and ranches in this area, and without this benefit the cooperatives could not receive wholesale power at cost for delivery to these farms: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the delegates to the Wasco County Pomona Grange No. 11, regularly assembled at Cherry Park Grange, this 3d day of February 1953, That the Congress be urged to continue to protect the interests of the people, as the owners of Government power-generating facilities, in their long-established right of first purchase of Government generated power, through their public bodies and nonprofit cooperatives created by the people for that purpose; and be it further*

*Resolved, That the Congress also be urged to make this right of first purchase by the people a realistic fact instead of only a theoretical right by authorizing the construction, by Government power-marketing agencies, of all transmission facilities needed to bring this power to public bodies and nonprofit cooperatives, and by appropriating the necessary moneys therefor.*

WASCO COUNTY POMONA POWER COMMITTEE,  
WALTER J. WEBB, Master.  
LILLIE O. TINDALL, Secretary.

**EVALUATION OF MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM**

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would like to discuss one further item, which is unrelated to the subject which I have just discussed, and which involves some floor-committee work which I need to do today.

I refer to a release issued by the Director for Mutual Security, Mr. Stassen. It is release No. 28. I wish to comment on the release by reading from and associating myself completely with the remarks which were made last night by Frank Edwards over the Mutual Broadcasting System, in regard to the problem which is represented by this release.

Mr. Edwards said last night:

In recent weeks the Senate has performed commendably by refusing to approve the nomination of various agency officials until those appointees had complied with the law. They were not confirmed until they had severed their financial relations with firms doing business with the Government.

Tonight I have before me some documents which disclose a situation which merits immediate Senate attention.

Mr. Harold Stassen, the Director for Mutual Security, has named a group of 55 business and financial executives who are to make an evaluation of the multibillion-dollar MSA program, at public expense. This group will be divided into 11 separate teams, 1 team to each country. The findings of these 55 men will determine how and where additional billions of taxpayers' dollars shall be spent in foreign-aid programs.

Mr. Stassen says: "The very essentiality of the program, coupled with the fact that it involves a large expenditure of public funds, requires that its operations be subjected to constructive examination by persons of competence and experience who are in a position to make an objective and independent judgment."

Any Senator who is interested will find those words of Mr. Stassen's on page 3 of DMS No. 28, available at his office.

I shall make it available in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in a moment. It will show who are some of the men who have been chosen to exercise their independent judgment.

Mr. Edwards goes on to say:

Just who are these men whom Mr. Stassen has chosen to make what he calls an objective and independent judgment? Do they qualify and, if so, on what grounds?

I have before me another very interesting document covering the financial commitments of Mutual Security Administration, setting forth the list of banking houses which have handled more than \$5 billion worth of MSA expenditures on a commission basis.

Upon comparing the list of financially interested institutions with the list of men selected by Mr. Stassen for Operation Tycoon, I find some very interesting connections. For example: On the team which will go to France at public expense to evaluate MSA performance is Mr. Orson Adams, vice president of the First National Bank of Boston. Checking against the record, I find that Mr. Adams' bank has handled \$101 million worth of MSA funds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is making a very interesting speech. However, I did not quite hear what the operation is to be



called. Is it Operation Typhoon or Operation Tycoon?

Mr. MORSE. It is Operation Tycoon, but I will tell the Senator what I think it will result in. It will result in Operation Typhoon, because it will flood this country with a lot of propaganda, which will make the rich boys richer before we get through with it.

Going back to Mr. Edwards' broadcast, he says:

On the team which will visit Belgium is Mr. Russell Wardburgh, vice president of Guaranty Trust Co. of New York City. His bank has handled more than \$421 million worth of mutual-security commitments.

The team which will make what Mr. Stassen calls an independent and objective evaluation of MSA expenditures in the Philippines will have as a member Mr. David Grove, Bank of America, San Francisco. The Bank of America, according to the official records, has done more than \$388 million worth of business in MSA commitments.

The list goes on and on. The records are available to any Senator who is interested. Mr. Stassen has selected men who are associated with concerns handling fabulous amounts of MSA financial commitments. He says he expects them to render an objective and independent judgment.

Not only does Stassen select men whose banks are doing billions of dollars' worth of business with MSA, but nowhere on the list will you find the name of a single representative of small business, farmers, or wage earners—the groups which make up the bulk of the Nation's taxpayers, the millions of men and women who provide the MSA funds.

In case any Member of the United States Senate is interested in Operation Tycoon and the relationships between its members and the MSA money, it might be well to check further into this matter.

The Senators who did such a commendable job in dealing with the financial affairs of Mr. Wilson and his teammates might ask some questions concerning Operation Tycoon.

Can a man deliver an objective and independent judgment on the expenditures of Government funds when he is connected with a bank that is making a profit handling those funds?

Some Senator might also inquire if any of the men chosen for Operation Tycoon were also contributors to Mr. Stassen's campaign funds.

To quote Mr. Stassen's own words again: "The very essentiality of the program, coupled with the fact that it involves a large expenditure of public funds, requires that its operations be subjected to constructive examination by persons of competence and experience who are in a position to make an objective and independent judgment."

Truer words were never spoken. The taxpayers of America must look to the Members of the United States Senate for assurance that the men who make the decisions are not the same men who profit by them. Operation Tycoon needs a public airing.

I quite agree with that statement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the press release DMS No. 28, dated February 9, 1953.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Harold Stassen, the Director for Mutual Security, announced today the appointment of a group of business and financial leaders to make an evaluation of the mutual-security program and personnel in 14 countries, 9 in Europe, and 5 in the Far East. The countries to be visited are those which involve the largest dollar expenditures

in the program: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Turkey, and the United Kingdom; Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam—the Associated States of Indochina; the Republic of China on Formosa; and the Philippines.

The evaluation group, which will serve without compensation, is headed by Mr. Clarence Francis, chairman of the board of General Foods Corp. Mr. Francis has selected 54 associates to assist him in the study. The group will divide itself into 11 teams. The mutual-security program will be studied in each country by a separate team, except for Holland and Belgium which will be studied by a single team, and the Associated States of Indochina which will be studied by one team.

The entire study group will meet in Washington February 9 and 10 for background discussion with Government officials responsible for administration of the mutual-security program. The teams will then go to their respective countries. It is anticipated that the reports of the various teams will be received in Washington toward the latter part of March. The preparation of the final report will be supervised by Mr. Francis, who will himself probably visit France, Germany, Greece, Turkey, and the United Kingdom.

Each team, within the area under its study, will look into the operations of the mutual-security program, including the current status of the different parts—both military and economic—of the program, the effectiveness of the program, and the effectiveness of United States organization and personnel. The group will look into, among other matters, the military end-item and training programs, the offshore procurement program, the use of defense-support goods or commodities financed by the Mutual Security Agency, the productivity program in Europe, and other major elements of the mutual-security program.

Mr. Stassen, in announcing the appointment of the evaluation group, said:

"I am delighted that this group of distinguished Americans has agreed to take part in the evaluation project. Knowing of their many other commitments, I would not have asked them to undertake a new obligation of this kind if I did not feel this particular project to be of real importance to the successful conduct of the mutual-security program. As is well known, President Eisenhower and those of us who are associated with him in this administration believe that this program is essential to the security of the United States.

"The very essentiality of the program, coupled with the fact that it involves a large expenditure of public funds, requires that its operations be subjected to constructive examination by persons of competence and experience who are in a position to make an objective and independent judgment.

"I believe that the work of this group during the next month will be of vital importance not only to me personally as Director for Mutual Security, not only to President Eisenhower's administration, but, in addition, to the welfare of the United States and of the whole free world."

Attached is a list containing the names and positions of the team leaders and the team members, and the countries to be visited.

#### MSP EVALUATION PROJECT

Task force coordinator: Mr. Clarence Francis, chairman of the board, General Foods Corp., Postum Building, 250 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Member: Mr. Edwin T. Gibson, Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, 116th Street and Broadway, New York, N. Y.

#### DENMARK

Team leader: Mr. Walter Marden Ringer, chairman of board and director, Foley Manufacturing Co., 3300 Northeast Fifth Street, Minneapolis, Minn.

Members: Mr. Paul E. Miller, director, agricultural extension service, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.; Mr. Newton Franklin Korhumel, president, Korhumel Steel & Aluminum Co., 2424 Oakton Street, Evanston, Ill.; Mr. Henry Bradford Arthur, economist, Swift & Co., Chicago, Ill.

#### FORMOSA

Team leader: Mr. Harry Amos Bullis, chairman of the board, General Mills, Inc., 400 Second Avenue S., Minneapolis, Minn.

Members: Mr. Norwood Francis Allman, senior partner (Allman, Kops, and Lee, American law firm of Shanghai, China), 390 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Clinton Morrison, vice president, manager, and director, the Holding Co., 1119 First National Soo Line Building, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mr. Raymond Tyson Moyer, deputy director, division of overseas activities, the Ford Foundation, 914 East Green Street, Pasadena, Calif.; Maj. Gen. William Arthur Worton, USMC (retired), care of Jonathan Club, 545 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

#### FRANCE

Team leader: Mr. Joseph Peter Spang, Jr., president, the Gillette Co., 15 West First Street, Boston, Mass.

Members: Mr. Orson Adams, Jr., vice president, First National Bank of Boston, 67 Milk Street, Boston, Mass.; Mr. Norbert A. Bogdan (now in France), director of finance, Ford International, 445 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Robert March Gaylord, president, Ingersoll Milling Machine Co., Rockford, Ill.; Mr. Malcolm Chilson Stewart, general counsel, the Gillette Co., 15 West First Street, Boston, Mass.

#### GERMANY

Team leader: Mr. Reuben Buck Robertson, Jr., president, the Champion Paper & Fibre Co., Hamilton, Ohio.

Members: Mr. Matthew L. Devine, care of Cresap, McCormick & Paget, 100 West Monroe, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. Bruce D. Henderson, general manager, purchases and traffic, Westinghouse Electric Corp., 401 Liberty Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Mr. Jefferson Ward Keener, vice president, B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio; Mr. Charles Emerson Marshall, vice president, Texas Industries, Inc., 400 First National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.; Mr. Walter W. Tangeman, executive vice president, Cincinnati Milling Machine Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.

#### GREECE

Team leader: Mr. Thomas A. Morgan, 217 East 62d Street, New York, N. Y.

Members: Mr. Reginald E. Gillmor, 2801 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mr. James C. Olson, partner, Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Industrial Engineering Corp., 285 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.; Mr. James L. Palmer, president, Marshall Field & Co., Chicago, Ill.; Dr. R. L. Sexton, Medical Building, 1801 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

#### HOLLAND AND BELGIUM

Team leader: Mr. Paul Boole McKee, president, Pacific Power & Light Co., 1509 Public Service Building, Portland, Ore.

Members: Mr. William T. Hamilton (now in Greece and Switzerland), purchasing agent, Ebasco Services, Inc., 2 Rector Street, New York, N. Y.; Vice Adm. Monroe Kelly, United States Navy (retired), Linkhorn Park, Virginia Beach, Va.; Mr. Hubert J. Soher, general partner, Hubert J. Soher—Economic Consultants, 2814 Russ Building, San Francisco, Calif.; Mr. Edgar Smith, partner, Edgar W. Smith & Sons, 852 Pittcock Block, Portland, Ore.; Mr. Russell L. Wardburgh, vice president, Guaranty Trust Co., 140 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

#### INDOCHINA

Team leader: Mr. Brayton Wilbur, president, Wilbur Ellis Co., 320 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Members: Mr. Gordon W. Aitken, 331 Rock Road, Glenrock, N. J.; Mr. Arthur I. Bloomfield, senior economist, Federal Reserve Bank

of New York, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Robert Anderson Magowan, partner, care of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, 70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.

## ITALY

Team leader: Mr. Frederick C. Crawford, president, Thompson Products, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

Members: Mr. Ernest Carhartt Brelsford, assistant treasurer, Thompson Products, Inc., 23555 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio; Mr. Carter Coslet Kissell, partner, Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, 1759 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio; Col. Whitcomb T. Rison, 2826 South Buchanan Street, Arlington, Va.; Mr. Lawrence E. J. Jamison, 25 Devon Road, Darien, Conn.

## PHILIPPINES

Team leader: Mr. F. N. Belgrano, Jr., president, the First National Bank of Portland, Portland, Oreg.

Members: Mr. Stephen F. Chadwick, attorney, 656 Central Building, Seattle, Wash.; Mr. William Howarth Dennick, consultant, McKinney & Co., Russ Building, 235 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Mr. David L. Grove, Bank of America National Trust & Savings Association, 300 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Mr. Richard Walberg, general partner, Swinerton & Walberg Co., 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

## TURKEY

Team leader: Mr. Frederick Morris Sayre, honorary chairman of the board, Corn Products Refining Co., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.

Members: Mr. Robert Blattner, Corn Products Refining Co., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Amos Herbert Flint, chief engineer, Corn Products Refining Co., 201 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. John William Scott, Jr., comptroller, Corn Products Refining Co., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.

## UNITED KINGDOM

Team leader: Mr. Henning W. Prentis, Jr., chairman of the board, Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa.

Members: Mr. Arthur B. Foye, senior partner, Haskins & Sells, 67 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Mr. James H. McGraw, Jr., 79 East Seventy-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.; Mr. Hans A. Widenmann, partner, Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., 42 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close this discussion by saying to my good liberal friends in and out of Congress: Stop talking about a honeymoon. The issues are already joined. It is a fight between liberalism protecting the interests of the American people, and reaction, which seeks now by law the enactment of proposals, which will appear on the floor of the Senate in the months ahead, to exploit the American people for the selfish interests of a few. There is no time to wait or waste. We must join the issue with them, figuratively speaking, and fight them in the streets, in the alleys, and on the housetops, and not let them get their guns of exploitation entrenched to mow down, as they will, if we do not stop them, the public interest.

Mr. President, I know of no time in American history when it was more important that the liberals in Congress cling tenaciously to our system of checks and balances. That is why the junior Senator from Oregon, starting on January 3, right through to Inauguration Day, on January 20, took the position that he proposed to make certain that there is maintained a constant vigilance in applying the checks and balances of

our Constitution against steamroller tactics in the Senate.

While on the subject, Mr. President, let me say to my critics that on January 20, when I blocked Cabinet nominations, I did so in order to keep faith with the forefathers of our country in making certain that time was provided for an analysis of recommendations of the Chief Executive to the Senate, and that no nomination would be steamrollered through the Senate.

For 8 years the junior Senator from Oregon, more than any other Senator, and many times in specific instances more than any other Senator, has objected to unanimous-consent requests when proposed by the Democratic majority, seeking to have immediate action without full consideration on the floor of the Senate. Why should I not apply the same principle to the Republicans? I shall never substitute the judgment of a committee for my responsibility on the floor of the Senate.

I make those comments because the broadcast by Frank Edwards and the evidence he presented in connection with the broadcast show again, I believe, how important it is that the liberals in the Senate be on guard and proceed to carry out their function of watchdogs, and do something more than bark. It is important that we bite into these issues and bring to the American people the facts they need to know in regard to the designs of a reactionary administration upon the public welfare.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that certainly he has bitten hard today, and certainly he has sounded in most able and effective fashion a challenge to REA groups and other friends of public power and all others who are genuinely concerned with public power and our other great natural resources.

So I congratulate the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Alabama in praising the Senator from Oregon on the purpose of his speech.

It may be that I am somewhat older than the Senator from Oregon and, therefore, have within me less bellicosity than does he. I hope very much that the incoming administration will not sponsor the measures the Senator from Oregon fears it will sponsor. Until it does sponsor such measures, I prefer to give the incoming administration the benefit of the doubt. I do not wish to have as close relationships with the incoming administration as might be indicated by the phrase "honeymoon," but I do wish to preserve friendly relationships with the administration.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, that I always admire very much his faith in people, but I have already seen enough and heard enough, having listened to and having read the proposals

of the spokesmen for the administration, and being aware of their purport, to be convinced that this is the hour to start the battle. That is why I made my speech today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, that if he is convinced of that, of course he should begin the battle. But I do not wish to start indiscriminate firing until I see precisely what is under way.

Mr. MORSE. Figuratively speaking, let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, that we are going to keep his gun in reserve, and we shall welcome his enlistment whenever he gets ready to join the ranks. [Laughter.]

## ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent entered into prior to the delivery of the address of the Senator from Oregon, the Senate agreed to adjourn at the conclusion of its business today until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon. Therefore, if there is no further business, under the previous order, the Senate now stands adjourned.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.), the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 16, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 13, 1953:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

George M. Humphrey, of Ohio, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund and United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

## IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon, 18A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general and effective March 1, 1953, to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with rank of lieutenant general and date of rank from January 19, 1948, under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

## IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

## To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. David Myron Schlatter, 62A, Regular Air Force, to be commanding general, Allied Air Forces, Southern Europe, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Bryant Le Maire Boatner, 362A, Regular Air Force, to be the Inspector General, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Hampton Atkinson, 90A, Regular Air Force, to be commander in chief, Alaskan Command, with rank of lieutenant general.

The following named officers to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

## To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada, 50A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, retired.



Lt. Gen. Idwal Hubert Edwards, 11A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. William Ellsworth Kepner, 6A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 13, 1953:

#### UNITED NATIONS

James J. Wadsworth, of New York, to be deputy representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Donald B. Lourie, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of State for Administration.

#### AIR FORCE

H. Lee White, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

#### PATENT OFFICE

Robert Clement Watson, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Patents.

## SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, facing the clamant calls and the demanding tasks of another week we would bow for a hallowed moment at this shrine of Thy divine grace. We acknowledge before Thee that our lives are restless pools. We are disturbed by the social turmoil of our times, burdened by many anxieties, tempted to cynicism by human cruelty and perversity, often disheartened by human folly which seems to profit so little by bitter reaping. Amid the tensions of these terrific days we seek in Thy presence a saving experience of inner quiet and certainty. We would lay our problems and tasks before Thee, not to escape them, but praying for Thy empowering so that with strength and courage we may carry them with a new gallantry.

May our attitudes and hopes widen every area of good will within the reach of our influence. In a divided and violent world may we be among those whom the generations to come shall call blessed, because our records here and now shall write our names among today's peacemakers. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 13, 1953, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under a special order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, it is the duty of the Presiding Officer to appoint a Senator to read Washington's Farewell Address on the 22d day of February. Since the 22d day of February falls upon Sunday, the reading of the farewell address this year will take place on February 23.

In making the appointment the Presiding Officer always alternates between the two sides of the aisle. At this time the appointment falls to a member of the majority. The Chair takes great pleasure in appointing the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] to perform this function.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF THE PILOTS' ASSOCIATION FOR THE BAY AND RIVER DELAWARE, BY TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Treasury Department had settled the claim of the Pilots' Association for the Bay and River Delaware, in the amount of \$5,205.52; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF DEED C. THURMAN, JR., BY PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Public Health Service had settled the claim of Deed C. Thurman, Jr., in the amount of \$1,108.34; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO TRANSMISSION OF FIREARMS IN THE MAILS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1715 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the transmission of firearms in the mails to or from persons or concerns having lawful use for them in connection with their businesses or their official duties, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration for the year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution relating to legislation affecting Federal support for butter now before the Congress of the United States

"Whereas the Federal Government support of butter prices at the present level of 90 percent of parity expires on March 31, 1953; and  
"Whereas butter prices already have fallen more than 15 cents a pound to that Federal support level of 67½ cents a pound for grade A butter; and

"Whereas the dairy industry is already suffering severely and would be dangerously injured by a further drastic price drop; and

"Whereas the Federal Government can legally use its flexible powers after March 31, 1953, to lower the support price level to 75 percent of parity which would be a cut of about 11 cents a pound; and

"Whereas the present Federal administration is pledged to maintain through 1953 and 1954 the Federal price supports of six basic farm commodities including corn, a dairy feed, raising a major dairy cost; and

"Whereas the price support level for butter determines the level of Federal price supports for other dairy products and is therefore basic: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the house of representatives and the senate concurring do urge that in simple fairness to dairying and to avert severe injury to producers and consumers of milk and milk products, the Federal Government forthwith announce that the present 90 percent support level for butter which expires on March 31, 1953, will be extended through the year 1954; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit a copy of this resolution, properly attested, by the proper officers of both houses, be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"JOHN A. HARTLE,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"ANCHER NELSEN,

"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, the 6th day of February, 1953.

"G. H. LEAHY,

"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"By MYRTLE R. BARNES,

"First Assistant Chief Clerk.

"Adopted by the senate, the 9th day of February, 1953.

"CY GOSREY,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved February 9, 1953.

"C. EDWARD ANDERSEN,

"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 32d session, do respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the 190th Fighter Interceptor Squadron of the Air National Guard of Idaho has just returned from a tour of active duty with the Air Force, stripped of its equipment and faced with the necessity of rebuilding completely in order to continue its function as part of the organized militia forces of the Nation; and